THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, B.D., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XII JUNE, 1926 No. 72

EDITORIAL

The current number of this journal concludes its sixth year; and we hope to celebrate our birthday by appearing next month in a new and more attractive cover. The prospect has sent us once again to that great work in which Carlyle immortalized the philosophy of Clothes, *Sartor Resartus;* and quickly there comes the answer to the many friends of Theology who have from time to time pointed out the defects of its clothing. "The beginning of all Wisdom," says Teufelsdröckh, "is to look fixedly on Clothes, or even with armed eyesight, till they become *transparent.*" Not but what a little later this same philosopher will admit that these outward things have their significance; as when he says that "in this one pregnant subject of Clothes, rightly understood, is included all that men have thought, dreamed, done, and been: the whole External Universe and what it holds is but Clothing; and the essence of all Science lies in the Philosophy of Clothes."

At any rate the time seems to have come for us to change; and we hope that our readers will be sufficiently pleased at the prospect, not only to renew their subscriptions, but also to gain further subscribers. The trend of our circulation has been steadily upward; but there is room for plenty of expansion yet.

But we cannot leave Carlyle without alluding to that moving passage in the chapter called "The Everlasting Yea," where he seems to speak direct to the heart of our generation, in accents worthy of Jeremiah:

> With other eyes, too, could I now look upon my fellow men: with an infinite Love, an infinite Pity. Poor, wandering, wayward man! Art thou not tried, and beaten with stripes, even as I am? Ever, whether thou bear the royal mantle or the beggar's gabardine, art thou not so weary, so heavy-laden; and thy Bed of Rest is but a Grave. O my Brother, my Brother, why cannot I shelter thee in my bosom, and wipe away all tears from thy eyes! . . . Thus was I standing in the porch of that "*Sanctuary of Sorrow*"; by strange, steep, ways had I too been guided thither; and erelong its sacred gates would open, and the "*Divine Depth of Sorrow*" lie disclosed to me.

If we can wring from our national trials something of that spirit, it may be that they will not be in vain.

FRANCIS BACON*
VISCOUNT ST. ALBAN AND LORD HIGH CHANCELLOR OF ENGLAND, 1561-1626

In "the only Christian church within the walls of old Verulam" fitly has remembrance been kept of Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Alban, who died on Easter Day three hundred years ago. There by his own wish he was buried: there is the famous statue of him, like that at Trinity College, Cambridge. There, and at Gorhambury, wherever else he may be forgotten, is his memory still green.

Very briefly may his life be recorded. Born January 22, 1551, the son of the Lord Keeper, a shrewd adviser of Queen Elizabeth, he studied at Cambridge and Gray's Inn; sat in Parliament; was a friend of Essex, yet later was the convincing advocate who proved his treason; was knighted in the first year of James I.; published many works on politics and science, and the *Advancement of Learning*, the first of his great works, in 1605; became Solicitor-General in 1607, and Attorney-General in 1613; was all through this time growing in wealth, and favour with the King, and in intimacy with his confidential advisers, Carr (whom yet he aided to bring to justice when his crimes were discovered) and Villiers (to whom to the end of his life he closely adhered).

In 1618 he became Lord Chancellor and Baron Verulam. In 1620 he published the *Novum Organum*. In 1621 he was created Viscount St. Alban, and, within a few days, when James's third Parliament met, he was charged by a disappointed suitor with taking money for the despatch of his suit, and the accusation was enlarged, by other complaints, into a more general one of corruption: he confessed to "a great deal of corruption and neglect"; he was imprisoned in the Tower: before the end of the year he was pardoned.

Then at Gorhambury there was what he called "a long cleansing week of five years' expiation and more." He wrote great books and saw some of them published: he continued to advise, though now unheeded, on public affairs; his friends clung to him: and he had peace at the last.

Eminent historians have eulogized his political work and his theories of government. Lawyers have accepted his own statement, "I was the justest judge that was in England these fifty years, but it was the justest sentence in Parliament that was these two hundred years." Philosophers and men of science

* An address partly spoken at the Bacon tercentenary, held at St. Albans, April 17, 1926.

have united to declare his vast services to the advancement of human knowledge. There we might leave his memory, as he himself did, to the judgment of posterity. But there are blots which cannot be forgotten, as there are services to mankind which cannot be ignored. There is, too, a character remarkable and full of charm. None of these things can be passed by without a word.

Of things which belong definitely to political or legal history only this need be said here. His conduct with regard to Essex and to Somerset was simply that of a barrister who sinks his personal feelings entirely in his professional obligations; and have we not heard of a judge who sentenced his own son to death? Of the charges of bribery I think the true view is this. His servants took bribes, as Aubrey says, who adds, "but his lordship always gave judgment *secundum æquum et bonum.*"* The complaints came from persons against whom he had given judgment. It was the custom to give presents to judges: a bad custom no doubt. I can remember when highly religious persons used to bribe voters: that bad custom has also passed. Bacon, so far as one can judge, was never influenced in the smallest degree by any presents he or his friends received. There is a tale of his having, at Buckingham's request, after judgment against trustees from whom a ward claimed interest on the rents they had received during his minority, made the claimant accept the money due without interest. He gave an order for a commission to investigate the disputed points. His accusers say this was a sham.† I do not know what grounds they have for saying so. I do not see any reason for doubting that when Bacon wrote to Buckingham, "I know I have clean hands and a clean heart," he spoke truly according to the custom and conscience of his time; and yet truly also when he said, when all the charges had been made against him, "There is a great deal of corruption and neglect, for which I am heartily and penitently sorry." The fact is that Bacon made many enemies: an honest man with a sharp tongue often does. He had caused, or helped in, the downfall of Coke, that bitter and arrogant lawyer and politician; and Coke's friends to a man determined on his destruction. Whatever wrong he had done, it was not that which caused his fall, but the jealousy and malice of men who envied his great powers and his high place. So he came to illustrate in himself what Lord Oxford and Asquith calls his grim aphorism, "Audacter calumniare semper aliquid haeret," of which the matter-of-fact English is, "If enough mud is thrown some of it will stick."

* *Brief Lives*, i. 71

† *E.g.*, E. A. Abbott, *Francis Bacon*, xxiv.-xxviii.

The reign of James I. in England saw the birth of the Nonconformist Conscience. The great age of Elizabeth, when men served God with passion, if they served Him at all, the age of passionate discoveries, passionate poets, of passionate devotion and passionate controversy, ended in an inevitable reaction. The hot fit passed, and moralists began to shiver at what lusty folk had said and done. There was no Luther now to say "Pecca fortiter." The sour Puritan emerged from the subsiding turmoil, and as the wit said, hanged his cat for killing a mouse on Sunday. Even resilient Shakespeare was pursued in his last days by a Precisian preacher in his own household.

The Nonconformist conscience was once distinguished from the ordinary conscience by the fact that the faults it denounces are those of other people. In James I.'s reign there burst forth a torrent of poisonous slander against every person who held high place in Church or State. A little of the condemnation was deserved. But undeserved was all but a tenth of what was said against the King and all but a twentieth of what was said against the great Chancellor.

That is the only explanation I can offer of Bacon's fall, without denying his admitted fault and carelessness. Yet I do not really understand it. I think I have read almost all who tell us the facts or who try to explain them; but I cannot explain it: if I offer this explanation, it is entirely as a tentative one that I offer it; but it seems to me to get as near the truth as the distance of time will allow us to do.

On his sixtieth birthday Bacon seemed to have reached the highest point of happiness and success. He was Lord High Chancellor of England; he had published perhaps his greatest work, the *Novum Organum;* he was established at Gorhambury with his books, his gardens, and his friends. Ben Jonson pictured the scene at York House in words that suggested, it may be, those of Clarendon about the society of Falkland at Great Tew.

> "Hail, happy Genius of this ancient pile!
> How comes it all things so about thee smile?
> The fire, the wine, the men! and in the midst
> Thou stand'st as if some mystery thou didst."

There must indeed have been a charm about the man: and his friends thought him as secure in the world's honour as he was in their affection,

> "Whose even thread the fates spin round and full
> Out of their choicest and their whitest wool."

It was not to be so. His hopes had blossomed. He bore his blushing honours thick upon him. Full surely, he thought, his

greatness had ripened; but there came a frost, a killing frost, and he fell.

The sentence of the Lords was severe almost to savagery; but, like most of the sentences of that time, it was not intended to be fully carried out. He was not kept long in the Tower; and after a while James, who had "shed tears at the beginning of [his] trouble," gave him a full pardon.

And so he went back to Gorhambury with its lovely terraces, its walks, its flowers, its shade, its peace. "God Almighty first planted a garden; and indeed it is the purest of human pleasures." So he would walk, with Mr. Hobbes beside him, talking philosophy and science, forgetting the past, maybe, yet dreaming—one is sure—of things to come. He knew that "troubles and adversities do move men's minds to religion." He was to prove this himself; for "man, when he resteth and assureth himself upon divine protection and favour, gathereth a force and faith which human nature in itself could not obtain."

It has often been said that Bacon's life was a double one: the life of the enthusiastic scholar wholly given to intellectual discovery, and the life of ambition, worldly and self-seeking. It may be that this, after all, is the explanation of a career and a character very difficult to understand. Yet if this explanation is to be complete much greater stress than has usually been laid must be laid on the bitter necessities of life, in a very hard time, for a poor man of enormous intellectual capacities: for it is a great mistake to think that such men do not feel the need of comfort or the lure of wealth; they often feel it more than others, for it seems to them the very necessity of their intellectual progress. No one can doubt that wealth, and honour, and fame were entirely secondary in Bacon's thought to the great aims and achievements of the mind; and yet they seemed to him indispensable things, and wealth not merely a crutch or a necessary evil, but a necessary good, without which the intellectual and even the moral life would be incomplete. But Bacon's was not a double life in the sense in which men commonly use the phrase: there was nothing he wished to conceal, nothing in one part of his life which seemed to him to interfere with the other part. He was a statesman, a lawyer, a historian, a man of letters, something of an artist, something even of a theologian, certainly a philosopher, certainly a man of Science; and all these interests and pursuits were undertaken in the same spirit and followed with the same zest. Even the pursuit of personal advancement, the horrible hunt for office or favour or emolument, was undertaken in exactly the same spirit, and with exactly the same persistence, as his search for knowledge, his scheme of universal

understanding, his discoveries in mind and matter. When he said he had taken all knowledge for his province, he said it with exactly the same enthusiasm as Wesley felt when he said he had taken the whole world for his parish: he meant that he had taken all life for the employment of his energies, the practical quite as much as the intellectual. He tried to be what the nineteenth century called a Superman. And that, it may well be, was the cause of his failure. There has never yet, outside exaggerated and ephemeral literature, been a Superman at all.

But he stood in the first rank of men of letters in the greatest age of English literature. He wrote, according to his own deliberate choice, in Latin, and appeared to despise his native tongue. Latin he wrote much as other scholars did; but when he wrote English he wrote like a master. His most famous epigrams are in English; his most pregnant sayings are immortal; they have passed, like the Bible and Shakespeare, into current coin, as proverbs indeed or axiomatic conclusions. His prose still sounds modern, and it will endure as long as our language. And his tastes were universal, in the study and in the outer air. Just as his delight in gardens shows Bacon in a happy vein of restful pleasure, so does his clever appreciation and criticism of Masques, for example, place him among the artists of his age. He was identified with the beginnings of that most beautiful invention; late in the sixteenth century we find him joining in their production, and on indeed till the last days of his greatness. His essay is that of an expert, and the masque which reached its highest charm under Ben Jonson and Inigo Jones (whose drawings have only quite lately been published)*, was the characteristic achievement of his age. Bacon was clearly a master and a Mæcenas in the art. Not only in the labours, but in the arts of his time was he a leader. Yet it is strange that he took little or no interest in the drama. He does not ever (I think) mention Shakespeare; and although he himself was a triumphant writer of English prose, he lightly esteemed every modern language as compared with Latin. Such were his private personal interests. In public life he was a politician as well as a lawyer. Stevenson once complained of Bacon's epigram that "Time is the greatest innovator,"† without much understanding, it may seem, of what was meant. Bacon's essay of Innovations, though somewhat crabbed, at least reveals one of the best thoughts of political wisdom. He sees how stable are things which have gone long together, and he sees the weakness of "new things" which do not harmonise with the old. But his is no blind conservatism.

* By the Walpole Society, 1925.

† *Letters*, i. 94.

"All this is true," he says, "if Time stood still; which contrariwise moveth so round that a forward retention of custom is as turbulent a thing as an innovation, and they that reverence too much old times are but a scorn to the new."

There could not be a sounder piece of advice in politics: we cannot doubt that he wrote it with an eye to King James's vacillating conservatism; but it had no influence on "the wisest fool in Christendom." Bacon was more sympathetic, more understanding, of the King's aims than James was of his. A great deal of foolish criticism has been uttered, as at the time a great deal of wicked slander was rumoured, about the King's "favourites." Bacon better than anyone else gives the true explanation. Kings, of all people, need true friends to whom they may open their hearts, and such they cannot have unless they raise up a person who shall wholly depend on them. This, as Bacon says, is no

"matter of grace or conversation . . . the Roman name attaineth the true use and cause thereof, naming them *Participes Curarum;* for it is that which tyeth the knot. And we see plainly that this hath been done, not by weak and passionate Princes only, but by the wisest, and most politic that ever reigned: who have oftentimes joined to themselves some of their servants, whom both themselves have called *Friends*, and allowed others likewise to call them in the same manner, using the word which is received between private men."

James made bad mistakes when he chose his friends, but those who knew them were often of the same mind as he was. There was much more than frivolous handsomeness about Buckingham: as a man, if he sinned, he repented, and Laud knew the secrets of his heart; as a statesman, he knew better than many of his contemporaries what way European politics were tending: if his advice had been followed, and the jealous Commons had not mistrusted him, it may well be that Europe would not have had, fifty years later, to contend against the supremacy of France. It was true of James that his friends were often not worthy of his kindness. Scotsmen are not always good judges of men, especially of Englishmen. But also the best men in England admired the King and respected him, too. Williams's Sermon on "Great Britain's Solomon"* took too high a note: but there was truth in the tributes of a saint like Andrewes and an honest man like Laud. And the like was even more true of Bacon: if he had his favourites and his flatterers, and was slandered for it, he had also for true friends some of the noblest men of his age. George Herbert was one of them; Lord Herbert of Cherbury another; Donne another: "Mr. Thomas Hobbes," says Aubrey,

* Funeral Sermon on James I.

" was beloved by his lordship, who was wont to have him in his delicate groves where he did meditate," and he adds, " in short, all that were great and good loved and honoured him."*

Ben Jonson knew the age he lived in well, and he said, " Within his view, and about his times, were all the wits born that could honour a language or help study," and added that fine tribute which gave Bacon his true place among the great ones of his time:

> " My conceit of his person was never increased towards him by his place or honours. But I have and do reverence him for the greatness that was only proper to himself, in that he seemed to me ever by his work one of the greatest men, and most worthy of admiration that had been in many Ages. In his Adversity I ever prayed that God would give him strength, for greatness he could not want. Neither could I condole in a word or syllable for him; as knowing no accident could do harm to virtue but rather help to make it manifest."†

And Cowley, seeing how he was the discoverer in Learning of a new way, compared him to Moses:

> " The barren Wilderness he past,
> Did on the very Border stand,
> Of the blest promis'd Land,
> And from the Mountain tops of his exalted wit
> Saw it himself, and show'd us it."

And these tributes were not to his exaltation, but after his disgrace.

Bacon's fame, as Cowley saw, must rest, not on his political advice or his action as a lawyer, but on his achievements as—the word was used then in a much wider sense than now—a philosopher.

Now let us say, summarily: Bacon as a philosopher and as a man of Science searched for Law: only it must be based not on hasty or imperfect generalisations, but on ascertained fact. That is the meaning of all his work. That explains Harvey's jibe that he wrote philosophy like a Lord Chancellor, which may also be true of his theology. I believe that at different times philosophers have not thought highly of Bacon's philosophy, or scientific men of his science. It is not uncommon for specialists to think lightly of those whose knowledge covers a wider field than their own. It is fit that one who has not either qualification should be silent. Let it suffice to say Bacon had a noble ideal of life, a glorious conception of knowledge; that he did not seek knowledge solely for its own sake, which sometimes even good men declare to be a right ambition, but that it might benefit his fellow-men. His belief was that all true knowledge must be based on fact; that all conclusions must be founded on

* *Brief Lives*, i. 70. † *Discoveries*, i. 101.

the study of causes. "It is rightly laid down," he said, "that to know truly is to know by means of causes." You could not dig too deep a foundation if your building was to be secure. He believed that the medieval science and the medieval philosophy were always inconclusive and generally erroneous because they were not based on rigid and scientific induction. True knowledge comes from the observation and the interpretation of nature. This does not apply to what are called the natural sciences alone: it applies also to history, to politics, to ethics. And in each of these spheres, in a greater or less degree, Bacon illustrated this belief of his by his own work. The danger of basing conclusions on a mere accumulation of facts has often been pointed out: it is not so great as that of founding conclusions on hasty generalizations and imaginative hypotheses. Bacon may not have been as fully awake to the first danger as to the second; but there is no doubt at all that he did not consider knowledge to spring from mere record; the mind, he knew, must interpret all it learned from observation. I do not think that even Dean Church quite does Bacon justice on this point.* His own observations may often have been unscientific, his knowledge incomplete, and his conclusions far from final; but he put before the world, as it had never been put previously, the real and only means of reaching right decisions; he showed the true road; he proclaimed the certainty of the existence of a new realm that men could discover, and he took the first step on the way towards it himself. Ever since his time scholars have followed him in his experimental and inductive method. He transformed the whole aim and ideal of study. More truly than the Renaissance may that which Bacon influenced be called the Age of the New Learning, and to him fitly may be given the title of the founder of modern Science.

It is impossible rightly to estimate the influence of Bacon without a glance at one who was at once a successor and a contrast, Descartes. Bacon practically ignored metaphysical questions: Descartes was primarily a metaphysician, and his method not inductive but deductive. What is clearly conceived in the mind must exist. He clears his thought therefore of all the accepted yet unproved beliefs—so far, like Bacon—but leaves two as certain: the existence of self and the existence of God. "Cogito, ergo sum"; and "I am imperfect: therefore perfection exists"—and perfection is God. The fundamental difference between the two thinkers is that between interrogation and anticipation of Nature; between belief in the objectivity of *φαινόμενα* and *νούμενα*; between Science and Philosophy.

* *Bacon*, p. 193. In *Baconiana* there is a saying of his: "Nature is a Labyrinth, in which the very haste you move with may make you lose your way."

How Bacon could have received the fully-developed philosophy of Descartes we cannot tell. Aubrey says of his own friend and instructor, Edward Davenant, "that he could not endure to hear of the *new* (Cartesian, etc.) *philosophy;* "for," said he, "if a new philosophy is brought in, a new divinity will shortly follow"; and [says Aubrey] he was right."* However that may be, one cannot help thinking that Bacon, in spite of the difference between his method and that of Descartes, would have welcomed the new support of the old theology and rejoiced in the new setting of the old ontological argument.

Bacon, in all his search into Nature, must, from the very business of his life, have been driven back upon Law. We claim, with obvious justice, that the whole range of what we call Natural Science has been altered since Bacon's day, enlarged beyond even his imagination, changed beyond recognition. Yet in spite of every step that has been securely reached, in chemistry, mechanics, biology, anthropology, there remains one fact unexplained, unassailable: the fact of Personality. Investigate as deeply as you can, with keenness as insatiable as Bacon's, and still there is one fact which separates man from Nature, and that is Personality. And Personality is the keystone of Law: every principle implicit in it, every assumption of any of its decrees, is based upon Personality. And Personality appears before Law as approachable, as amenable, as the subject of its authority, simply because of that strange, if not unexplainable thing we call Conscience. Or put it, equally truly, in another way: at the back of the claim of human law is the authority of human conscience.

And there at once, the Christian believes—and Bacon undoubtedly believed—you are brought face to face with God. There is a weak conscience, an ignorant conscience, a bad conscience; we who are not lawyers may say that there have been weak laws, ignorant laws, bad laws. But the real law, the true law, the real conscience, the true conscience, bears ever the illumination of God who gave it. So Bacon, as lawyer no less than as investigator, was brought to the feet of God. There always had been his resting-place, "I had rather believe all the fables in the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this Universal Frame is without a Mind."

And when he comes, see how he feels himself to be in the Holy Place, how instinctively he takes off his shoes; how the sharp words of enquiry and criticism are silenced; how hushed and solemn is his voice when he moves from Science to Theology, because he comes by the way of Law. He has been a man in

* *Brief Lives*, i., 201.

authority, and under authority; and, like the Centurion of old, he knows that beyond all outward greatness, within all secrets of Nature he can search, lies the supreme authority that speaks, person to person, the word to man from the Personality of Almighty God.

Bacon's theological beliefs may well have been influenced, or coloured, by his legal training. So, in a different way, was what may be called his ecclesiastical policy.

Now, lawyers are not commonly good advisers in matters concerning Religion. Their profession makes them meticulous and conservative, though their practice reveals often the reverse of either quality; and the study of theology, still more the practice of godliness, acts differently. The truth of Law may tend to make men obedient, but the truth of Christ is given to make men free. Deep though its roots lie in the past and precious its deposit, the revelation of the Holy Spirit in the Church is in its very essence progressive: God speaks to each new age as it comes, explaining what each may learn from the Revelation of the Eternal Son. It might be expected that to Bacon of all men this would be clear as crystal. But hardly more than a glimmer of this truth appears in his scheme for the reformation of the English Church—"Certain Considerations touching the better Pacification and Edification of the Church of England." [This was written in 1604, but not (apparently) published till 1640.] In it he made few definite proposals, but generally favoured toleration.

> "I am persuaded that the papists themselves should not need so much the services of penal laws if the sword of the spirit were better edged, by strengthening the authority and repressing the abuses."

Unity he advocated, as in the Essays; but here he seemed prepared to purchase it at the cost of the unique position of the English Church.

> "It is good we return unto the ancient bonds of unity in the church of God, which was one faith, one baptism; and not one Monarchy, one discipline; and that we observe the league of Christians as it is penned by our Saviour Christ, which is in substance of doctrine this: 'He that is not with us is against us'; but in things indifferent and but of circumstance this, 'He that is not against us is with us.'"

An eminent historian* has approved this as a welcome to all who base their faith on the belief that truth may be gained by search and enquiry. But who is there who does not so believe? And indeed it was not the Church of England which would insist on "things indifferent," but the two opposing parties—the

* S. R. Gardiner, *History of England* (1603-1642), i. 147.

Romans who insisted on the absolute supremacy of the Pope, and the Puritans who insisted on the universal obligation of their own interpretation of the Bible. At the beginning of James I.'s reign the English Church had hardly emerged from the struggle for a historical Episcopacy and the Orders which "have been since the Apostles' time." Without abandoning this it would be impossible to agree with those men who called bishops "bite-sheeps" and surplices "rags of popery." The Millenary Petition showed quite clearly that what the Puritans wanted was not toleration but dominance. James was much wiser than Bacon when he summed up the situation—"No Bishop, no King"; while as for the Romanists, with the Gunpowder Plot still fresh in every one's memory and ginger still hot in the mouths of the Commons, toleration was (as we say now) "outside the range of practical politics." And practical politics were just what Bacon never did understand. Every institution must have a base, a bed-rock. No basis of *agreement* can be found (what-else she may be) in free enquiry.

In practical Church politics, then, Bacon showed no more insight than other lawyers: yet the nice balance of Justice, which he preserved in his court, he carried with him, which not so many lawyers do, into matters ecclesiastical. When he wrote of Unity he did not forget that there could be false Peace, false Unity, and yet laughed at "the Morrice Dance of Hereticks." He was gentle with Puritans, and exonerated even the seminary priests from treasonable practices and condemned only those who "by their artifices and poisonous methods had depraved the very sacrifice of the Mass, which before was a sweet and harmless thing."

The tolerant spirit which is inseparable from all true godliness was certainly conspicuous in Bacon. That it was not the toleration of indifference is plain enough in his prayers. In theories of Church politics he was not in advance of the most commonplace personages of his time. It was very different when he prayed and came face to face with God. No one can doubt the genuineness of his prayers.

Can anything be truer than "The Writer's Prayer," with its suggestion of (I think) Aquinas?

"Thou, O Father, who gavest the visible light as the first-born of thy creatures, and didst pour into man the intellectual light as the top and consummation of thy workmanship, be pleased to protect and govern this work, which coming from thy goodness, returneth to thy glory. Thou after thou hadst reviewed the works which thy hands had made, beheldest that every thing was very good, and thou didst rest with complacency in them. But man, reflecting on the works which he had made, saw that all was vanity and vexation of spirit, and could by no

means acquiesce in them. Wherefore, if we labour in thy works with the sweat of our brows, thou wilt make us partakers of thy vision and thy sabbath. We humbly beg that this mind may be stedfastly in us; and that thou, by our hands, and also by the hands of others, on whom thou shalt bestow the same spirit, wilt please to convey a largess of new alms to thy family of mankind. These things we commend to thy everlasting love, by our Jesus, thy Christ, God with us. Amen."

Or, again, what is called "a prayer, or psalm, made by the Lord Bacon, Chancellor of England" (from the *Resuscitatio*):

"Most gracious Lord God, my merciful Father, from my youth up, my Creator, my Redeemer, my Comforter. Thou, O Lord, soundest and searchest the depths and secrets of all hearts: thou acknowledgest the upright of heart; thou judgest the hypocrite: thou ponderest men's thoughts and doings as in a balance: thou measurest their intentions as with a line: vanity and crooked ways cannot be hid from thee.

"Remember, O Lord, how thy servant hath walked before thee: remember what I have first sought, and what hath been principal in my intentions. I have loved thy assemblies: I have mourned for the divisions of thy Church: I have delighted in the brightness of thy sanctuary. This vine which thy right hand hath planted in this nation, I have ever prayed unto thee, that it might have the first and the latter rain; and that it might stretch her branches to the seas and to the floods. The state and bread of the poor and oppressed have been precious in mine eyes: I have hated all cruelty and hardness of heart: I have, though in a despised weed, procured the good of all men. If any have been my enemies, I thought not of them: neither hath the sun almost set upon my displeasure: but I have been as a dove, free from superfluity of maliciousness. Thy creatures have been my books, but thy Scriptures much more. I have sought thee in the courts, fields and gardens, but I have found thee in thy temples.

"Thousands have been my sins, and ten thousands my transgressions; but thy sanctifications have remained with me, and my heart, through thy grace, hath been an unquenched coal upon thine altar. O Lord, my strength, I have since my youth met with thee in all my ways, by thy fatherly compassions, by thy comfortable chastisements, and by thy most visible providence. As thy favours have increased upon me, so have thy corrections; so as thou hast been always near me, O Lord, and ever as my worldly blessings were exalted, so secret darts from thee have pierced me; and when I have ascended before men, I have descended in humiliation before thee. And now, when I thought most of peace and honour, thy hand is heavy upon me, and hath humbled me according to thy former loving-kindness, keeping me still in thy fatherly school, not as a bastard, but as a child. Just are thy judgements upon me for my sins, which are more in number than the sands of the sea, but have no proportion to thy mercies; for what are the sands of the sea, earth, heavens, and all these are nothing to thy mercies. Besides my innumerable sins, I confess before thee, that I am a debtor to thee for the gracious talent of thy gifts and graces, which I have neither put into a napkin, nor put it, as I ought, to exchangers, where it might have made best profit, but misspent it in

things for which I was least fit; so I may truly say, my soul hath been a stranger in the course of my pilgrimage. Be merciful unto me, O Lord, for my Saviour's sake, and receive me into thy bosom, or guide me in thy ways."

The spirit of these beautiful prayers was the spirit, I cannot doubt, in which at the last he prepared to bring his life's work before the judgment seat of God.

It always seems to me that in the last days of Bacon's life he prefigured those wonderful scenes in the second part of *Faust*, in which Goethe shows the man of insatiable intellectual and moral curiosity, after strange experiences of passion and of thought, and after setting to work on schemes of practical philanthropy, summing up the last efforts for the benefit of the world which he had brought to success. To the Spirit of Evil his work looked like failure. He knew better what it really meant.

"The night seemed deeper now to press around me,
But in my inmost spirit all is light."

"Die Nacht scheint tiefer tief hereinzudringen,
Allein im Innern leuchtet helles Licht;
Was ich gedacht, ich eil es zu vollbringen;
Des Herren Wort, es giebt allein Gewicht.
Vom Lager auf, ihr Knechte! Mann für Mann!
Lasst glücklich schauen, was ich kühn ersann!
Ergreift das Wertzeug, Schaufel rührt und Spaten!
Das Abgesteckte muss sogleich gerathen.
Auf strenges Ordnen, raschen Fleiss
Erfolgt der allerschönste Preis.
Dass sich das grösste Werk vollende
Genügt ein Geist für tausend Hände."*

No man who has risen to the highest in intellectual labour can fail to know that he has succeeded. So Faust:

* Bayard Taylor translates:

"The night seems deeper now to press around me,
But in my inmost spirit all is light;
I rest not till the finished work hath crowned me.
God's word alone confers on me this weight.
Up from your couches, vassals, man by man!
Make grandly visible my daring plan!
Seize now your tools: with spade and shovel press!
The work traced out must be a swift success.
Quick diligence, severest ordering,
The most superb reward shall bring:
And, that the mighty work completed stands,
One mind suffices for a thousand hands."

Faust, II., v. 5.

"Ja! diesem Sinne bin ich ganz ergeben,
Das ist der Weisheit letzter Schluss.

* * * * *

Es kann die Spur von meinen Erdetagen
Nicht in Aeonen untergehn!
Im Vorgefühl von solchem hohen Glück
Geniess ich jetzt den höchsten Augenblick."*

And so the flights of angels sang him to his rest. Goethe gave to Faust the prayer of Horatio for Hamlet:

"Gerettet ist das edle Glied
Der Geisterwelt vom Bösen:
Wer immer strebend sich bemüht,
Den können wir erlösen;
Und hat an ihm die Liebe gar
Von Oben Theil genommen,
Begegnet ihm die selige Schaar
Mit herzlichem Willkommen."†

May we not use of Bacon those words of Lucretius?

"Quo magis in dubiis hominem spectare periclis
Convenit; adversisque in rebus noscere qui sit.
Nam veræ voces tum demum pectore ab imo
Ejiciuntur; et eripitur persona, manet res."‡

"All things fell around him: yet the greatness of the man survived. He went back to his gardens, to his books, and to his experiments, and from one of the last he died. Still, as for so long years, he yearned to know the Truth, and surely at the last the Truth has made him free. When he shed man's frailties and the garment of mortality he came unveiled to

* Bayard Taylor translates:

"Yes, to this thought I hold with firm persistence,
The last result of wisdom stamps it true.

* * * * *

The traces cannot, of mine earthly being,
In æons perish,—they are there!
In proud fore-feeling of such lofty bliss,
I now enjoy the highest Moment—this!"

Faust, II. v. 6.

† Bayard Taylor translates:

"The noble Spirit now is free,
And saved from evil scheming:
Who ere inspires unweariedly
Is not beyond redeeming.
And if he feels the grace of Love
That from on High is given,
The Blessed Hosts that wait above
Shall welcome him in heaven."

Faust, II. v. 6.

‡ *Lucretius*, III. 55 *ff.*

look upon the face of God. Man passes, but the eternal Reality remains. Eripitur persona: manet res."

When such a life is recorded, the memory of so great a man recalled, the faults not forgotten but the wisdom gratefully remembered, the thought should end, as all Christian thought should, in prayer. Remembering Francis Bacon three centuries after his death, what can we do better than say those words of Robert Louis Stevenson ?

" . . . Guide us, Thou who didst guide our fathers; and . . . receive our penitent and grateful thought; and hear us, when we pray for others and ourselves; that they may be blessed and we be helped; and give us, beyond our deserts to receive, beyond our imaginations to expect, the grace to die daily to our evil, and to live ever the more and ever the more wholly to Thee and to our fellow men."

W. H. Hutton.

BARON FRIEDRICH VON HÜGEL AND HIS WORK

I

Since the death of Newman in 1890 an impressive change has come over the scope and character of the contribution of philosophy and poetry to our understanding and appreciation of the fundamentals of religion. Bradley, Bosanquet, Ward, and McTaggart have affected our estimates of what constitutes both the appearance and reality of religious experience. Coventry Patmore, Francis Thompson, and Mrs. Meynell have between them effected a substantial revival of Catholicism and Scholasticism in the temper and texture of English poetry, and although all these writers have passed away their work in various ways affected the intellectual development of Friedrich von Hügel, who passed away in 1925, the most distinguished Christian and Catholic philosopher of our day. Known intimately to never more than a comparatively small circle, yet an intellectual circle at that; of established and increasing reputation amongst scholars and students only long after his fiftieth year, yet more welcome and acceptable as an expositor of his own faith to those outside rather than within that fold; master of a curiously rugged, uncouth yet massive English which takes up, here the seventeenth-century grandeurs of Sir Thomas Browne, and there the strange felicities of C. M. Doughty in our own day, yet overlooked by the professional scrutineers of style; to the multitude

below either completely unknown or, if heard of, confused with his brother, the distinguished anthropologist, Baron Anatole von Hügel, he was to those who, in whatever religious communion, came to him as disciples and friends, always their Gamaliel, "*the Baron.*"

The outward circumstances of von Hügel's life are easily told, and have been set forth in an admirable article by Mr. Edwyn Bevan. Born at Florence in May, 1852, Friedrich von Hügel had a Scotch mother—a niece of Sir James Outram of Indian Mutiny fame, and a German father, who was then Austrian Minister at the Grand Ducal Court of Tuscany. From Florence the Minister went to the Belgian Court at Brussels, and presently retired to England in 1867. Hence the education of his sons was of an unusually cosmopolitan character, and the English Church Catechism, a Lutheran pastor and the German Catholic historian, Alfred von Reumont, all played their part in fashioning the subtle and sensitive soul of Friedrich von Hügel. Although he never went to any school or university, he acquired not only a mastery of several modern languages, but also a more than competent knowledge of Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, and although after an inner crisis at the age of eighteen his main pursuit was in the field of religious thought and philosophy he had a sustained interest in geology and entomology, and from these sciences drew not a few of his more picturesque images. A severe attack of typhus soon after his father's death in 1870, not only impaired his general activities for some fifteen years, but also left him with a deafness which for the rest of his life was a severe and painful barrier to sustained social intercourse. Little by little, however, he developed a series of critical studies on biblical documents, and his general sympathy with modern criticism thereof led many to an erroneous supposition that he was actually a convinced adherent of what is commonly called modernism. But he had far too firm a hold, far too penetrating an appreciation of historical and institutional religion ever seriously to weaken in his position, and he remained always a convinced, a devout, and a practising Roman Catholic. Late in middle life, when his studies in the Lives of the Saints were gradually converging towards what was to be his *magnum opus*—the "Mystical Element of Religion"—he came under the spiritual influence of the Abbé Huvelin, Vicaire of St. Augustine, Paris, and to him and to M. Olier he owed what was a second birth in his vital religious life. So rich, although so unprofessional a training and experience brought him into contact with most of the outstanding intellects then functioning in religious scholarship and speculation: with Holtzmann, the German critic; with Eucken and Troeltsch, with Laberthonnière, Duchesne

and Loisy, and in this country with Lacey, Gore, Balfour, Edwyn Bevan, C. G. Montefiore, and many others, and especially with the late George Tyrrell, in whose "unhappy and restless career," as Mr. Bevan rightly says, "the Baron played the part of a good angel." In 1873 Baron von Hügel married Lady Mary Herbert, daughter of Sidney Lord Herbert of Lea, by whom he had three daughters, one of whom is a Carmelite nun. Apart from miscellaneous papers, his published works were four in number, three of them of permanent importance. These are *The Mystical Element of Religion*, being two volumes, published in 1909 and republished with a new preface in 1923; *Eternal Life*, 1912, and a volume of *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion*, 1921. It was in the Synthetic Society at Oxford and in the London Society for the Study of Religion that some of his most moving and intimate utterances were expressed, and it was in those Societies that his personal magnetism proved so compelling to those who heard him. He died in London on January 27, 1925.

It was some fifteen years ago that a chance meeting in a tram with George Tyrrell led to my visiting the Baron at Vicarage Gate, Kensington. At that time Father Tyrrell was under ecclesiastical discipline in the Church of Rome. He had given in the Common Room of the King's College Theological Hostel (then in Mecklenburgh Square) a brilliant statement of his general doctrinal position as he had reached it in his new book on *Christianity at the Cross Roads*.* After the discussion Tyrrell went home, and I presently found myself in the same tram as he on the way to Clapham, where he was then lodging. I found a very tired, a very wistful, and a very determined man. We engaged in conversation, which was continued in a long and restless walk round Clapham Common, until presently he said, "You must come and see the Baron." A day or two later we journeyed together to Vicarage Gate, and there he introduced me. That first meeting is not easily forgotten: surrounded by books, papers, and periodicals in a dark and heavily curtained library stood a man, the Baron, of massive yet somewhat loose frame, a noticeable forehead, a deep and vibrant voice, and eyes with a sunken fiery glow. Conversation turned upon Francis Thompson—"A strange man," said the Baron, "but not more strange than Tyrrell, and like him" (turning affectionately to the ex-Jesuit), "a bad subject"—but presently he remarked, "You must not let your poetry run away with your philosophy; read Père Grou and take the *Exercises* of St. Ignatius."

So ended our first meeting, and a few days later I received

* On this occasion Tyrrell doubted whether the uniqueness of the Christian revelation was any longer tenable.

from the Baron one of my most treasured books, *The Spiritual Writings* of Père Grou, a French Platonist and Jesuit of the Revolutionary epoch. It was his own copy, carefully annotated, and any references to the Quietist doctrine of the One Act of Pure Love especially marked. Von Hügel refers* in terms of great appreciation to the combination in this French translator of Plato of vigorous critical scholarship and of deepest spirituality.

I pass from this unexpected participation in the closing stages of George Tyrrell's career, soon to close in his death at Storrington, that Sussex village imperishably associated with the name of Francis Thompson, to a later scene in Vicarage Gate. Some two or three years went by, and then the intervening correspondence was succeeded by another visit to the Baron some time after the publication of *Eternal Life*. Our conversation turned upon some passages in that book (as elsewhere), in which he records his indebtedness to the great Jesuit theologian, de Lugo (†1660), and also to the appraisement of the humility of Jesuit novices. A pause ensued in the talk and then, standing up and over me, he exclaimed in his deeply vibrant voice, " Under God I owe my salvation to the Jesuits, but," and I trembled as he added, gripping my shoulder, " don't *you* ever become a Jesuit." O the wealth of gratitude in that first sentence, and the loving insight of the second !

Some years later I became a member of the London Society for the Study of Religion, then meeting at Caxton Hall, Westminster, and subsequently at the Baron's own house and at that of Mr. Claude Montefiore. It was always the Baron's pleasure to receive an advance copy of the paper being read at any one meeting, and as a consequence it was his privilege, and one to the very great profit of the Society, to open each discussion. Those qualities in the classics to which Mr. Baldwin recently referred in an address, *pietas*, *gravitas*, and a " sense of the importance and value and truth of words " were precisely those that characterized the Baron's every utterance. Even in a Society professedly devoted to the discussion of high and exalted themes, he raised the argument to the loftiest level, infused it with the spirit of piety, of gravity, of sincerity; but, above all, nourishing those present and hanging on his words with a spirit which was more than one of enthusiasm, it was a sacred passion for truth, a passion for the objective realization of Truth in the Being of God, a passion for balance, a passionate conviction of the reality of God, and of the ultimate joy awaiting all souls in His presence. Two great moments stand out in my mind amongst many notable deliverances: the first a difficult discussion

* *M. E*, II. 138 *ff*.

on the constant tendency in popular Christian theology and devotions to stressing the sacred humanity to the point of patripassian heresy—*i.e.*, to the point of ascribing in the Divine Nature a permanent experience of suffering with as well as of understanding sympathy with men. The Baron would not compromise with this heresy, long ago condemned at the Council of Ephesus; and a vehement and inspired speech, which left him "exhausted and trembling,"* closed with the repeated reminder, "Who for the sake of the *joy* before Him endured the Cross." And the second entirely different yet entirely characteristic utterance was on the occasion of some opening remarks in reference to Benedetto Croce's displacement of religion by philosophy, and of his identification of history with philosophy: "I have been discussing Croce," said the Baron in his whimsical way, "with my little dog in Kensington Gardens. We have gone over his philosophy, and I am bound to say that there is far more sense in my little dog than there is in Croce's philosophy."

II

A.—The most remarkable and most important of von Hügel's published works is *The Mystical Element of Religion*. In some 860 closely printed pages he weaves as it were a rich and wondrous theological tapestry woven about the life and teaching of Saint Catherine of Genoa and her friends. This tapestry is more than theological, it is historical; great figures appear in it: Plato and Aristotle, Christ and St. Paul, Dante and Thomas Aquinas, Saint John of the Cross and Saint Teresa, a great crowd of modern philosophers and scholars from Kant to Professor Alexander, from Leibniz to Newman, from Lessing to Laberthonnière. But it is more than a theological or an historical tapestry, it is a tapestry of thought traced in richest affiliations, subtly blended and cunningly contrived to express two great minds in relation to a third, two finite but noble intellects in relation to God Who is mind (He builds his faith on that as strongly as ever Browning did). The first of these two noble minds is that of St. Catherine of Genoa herself, and she is, as it were, the finite centre of that circle whose circumference is nowhere and whose real centre is the Incarnate Logos. Little by little the reader's interest in this Saint passes from the comparatively slight incidents of her outward life to an ever-deepening appreciation of the boldness and the range of her thought, in, and out, and over the profoundest experiences of the interior life of the soul, until we take through the accumulating waves of fact and of reflexion a voluntary plunge such as

* This phrase, so true, is Mr. Bevan's.

she would have us do (a plunge to which we are led by the Baron's craft), a plunge into waters that hurt yet heal, that pain but purify the soul, in proportion to our sincerity, of "hard self-centredness, petty self-mirrorings and jealous claimfulness above all."* We rise from the study of this book knowing that, as after reading Plato's *Republic* we are sealed unto Justice, as after reading the Fourth Gospel, the Apocalypse, and 1 Corinthians we are sealed unto Love, and as after reading Kant we are irrevocably sealed unto Law, so, after reading St. Catherine's treatise on Purgatory and von Hügel's study of her life and doctrine, we are reconciled and sealed unto suffering for the sake of the joy set before us; sealed unto suffering in the fire of Justice, sealed unto suffering in the fire of Law, sealed unto suffering in the fire of Love, the Love that will not let us go.

The whole book falls into three parts, with an appendix (in Vol. I.) dealing with the documents from the point of view of modern criticism. In Part I. von Hügel analyzes the three chief forces of Western civilization—viz., the Hellenistic, which makes for richness and harmony of life; the Christian, which makes for an ever-deepening sense of the abysmal depths of personality, especially as uniquely revealed in the Person of Christ; and the scientific, which in our day makes chiefly for an ever-enlarging appreciation of brute fact and iron law. All these three forces, in von Hügel's mind, are necessary to man's full life, and our author's unwavering hold on life as a whole in all its multiplicity is never more impressive than in these two chapters.

B.—In the second chapter we have von Hügel's most distinctive, original, and important contribution to the fundamental analysis of any world-religion. It is through this chapter that his influence was most immediate, especially upon those outside the Catholic Church. He was frequently urged to reprint these thirty-two pages as a separate publication, but in the Preface to the second edition of the whole work he bids us beware of the "booklet presentation of the Philosophy of Religion." He admits that "to the last as at the first, to the majority of men as to the minority of men, simple booklets on religion will always be required," but he makes a dignified claim for the dignity of his subject: "It is not of necessity a presumption to find oneself slowly, in later life, and with persistent surprise, solicited to write, and to do so, not for the readers of compilations, but for the writers of first-hand works. After all, there exist poets' poets, do there not? Why not then also writers' writers or thinkers' thinkers?"†

* *M. E.*, II. 386.

† Preface to second edition.

The second chapter, then, is a careful exposition and illustration of an extremely illuminating yet simply constructed analysis of the three fundamental constituents of any world-religion. The influence of the Hegelian dialectic is strong in von Hügel's work, and it abounds in triads and subtriads; nevertheless, this threefold analysis, when read, proves to be, I think, immediately acceptable, and it is enforced by illustrations from psychology, from dialectic itself, from the history of religions, from the history of races, sexes, ages, and professions, from the history of sects within any religion, from the history of different types of religious monasticism, and from the inner history of individual souls.

These constituents are first the institutional, in which any and every religious position and practice must take form, and in adherence to which, in membership of the body corporate, the religious life finds necessarily a main part of its sustenance. Next there is in any and every religion, though not always in evenly articulated form, a credal and critical constituent which expresses in formulas positive or negative, in catechisms long or short, in theologies new or old, the intellectual presuppositions which are indispensable if the institutional is to be sustained and succoured in times of doubt, storm, and stress. Lastly, there is in any and every religion a constituent impatient of expression or compression within institutional bounds, too elusive, too grounded in individual intuitions and in interior personal experience to be patient of intellectual definition—a constituent tinged by but not solely composed of emotional and instinctive factors, the constituent in which ultimately the first two are grounded, the constituent of immediate experience of the Given, the constituent which, if nourished and rightly ordered, leads to a progressive realization of the Presence of God, the constituent which can only be called the mystical element of Religion.

These three constituents comprise, then, in the institutional, religion's way of living; in the credal and critical, religion's way of thinking; in the mystical, religion's way of being. In the history of Christianity we may say that the message came from the East, the meaning from Greece, and the machinery from Rome: once more, the institutional, the credal and critical, and the mystical.

But von Hügel does not leave the analysis there: he applies it to the three stages of childhood, adolescence, and maturity; for the child the institutional, that is, the way of living, is most in evidence; for the youth who puts all things to question, the way of thinking, the credal and critical constituent is supreme; for the mature mind tried in fires of pain and woe and with apprehension deepened by the years between, the mystical tends to

be increasingly important. Von Hügel, however, does not suggest, and indeed is anxious to refute any suggestion that these three constituents are chronologically successive or quantitatively of differing values. Rather, at each and every level of individual experience the three constituents are implicit; with a Newman, perchance, the intuitive and mystical is much in evidence in the early years, the institutional and the critical in later years; the child is not without his intimations of immortality, and even the Quaker must adhere to the institutional in however attenuated a form in his weekly "meeting." Von Hügel even suggests that professions variously incline to one or other of the three constituents: to the soldier, lawyer, administrator, statesman the institutional is the way preferred; to the scientist, whether he be a doctor, a chemist, a physicist, or a mathematician, the critical and credal, the intellectual way will be preferred; while to the philanthropist, the poet, the artist, the craftsman, the mystical, the way of feeling will be preferred. In like manner Greek religion tended to be for the many a most ancient traditional culture; for select groups an experimental-ethical life, a school of the mysteries, a society of mystics, and for the few it tended to be a philosophy. In Brahminism the institutional and external predominate; in Buddhism the intellectual and the mystical; in Mahometanism the mystical constituent finds no easy place. In Judaism, again, according to von Hügel, the intellectual constituent developed slowly; the mystical is almost wholly absent until the Exilic period; in the Book of Wisdom all three sides find place. The Pharisees express the external, traditional, institutional; the Sadducees the rationalizing and critical; the Essenes the ascetical and mystical ways. The trinity of tendency is easily recognized in individuals and in currents of ideas during the Renaissance and Reformation periods: Sir Thomas More lays down his life in defence of institutional religion, yet he is a devoted lover of the new learning and criticism and also of an ardent interior and mystical life. The early Reformers eventually intensified institutional religion until it became that "heavy untransparent thing, Continental Protestantism," in reaction to which the Anabaptists and other scattered sects attempted to sustain and develop a purely interior ecstatic mysticism. Within Roman Catholicism the Jesuits commonly stand for the institutional and obedience thereto; the Benedictines for scholarship and criticism, the Franciscans for affective mystical spirituality. And yet in each order, each sect, all three constituents are always in greater or less degree represented and expressed.

The argument, however, is even more important than the descriptive analysis. To the analysis von Hügel adds the

argument that each constituent thrives and can only thrive through friction with the others. There can be no vital organic unity without diversity, no harmonies to be prized unless there be contributing discords, and hence, according as the soul's first awakening has been occasioned by one or other of the three great constituents, so will be its after pre-disposition. Von Hügel puts in strongest terms the apparently unconditional claim of Christianity. "Religion's all or nothing, sir," "the distinctive religious act is, as such, an unconditional surrender." Hence religion comes to be regarded as brooking no rival: "it can safely reign, apparently, alone." It comes to be regarded as incapable of change, and the institutional is the bulwark against movement and development. Yet the soul once having made an unconditional surrender, even through or with the assistance of the institutional constituent, tends as a consequence of that unconditional surrender to shrink away from the external and to rejoice in a new interior freedom so that the mystical as it were is conceived to be the bulwark against the institutional. In like manner, religion, by claiming a man's whole soul, necessarily claims his intellect, and so once again a measure of friction will ensue. This friction, contends von Hügel, is healthy, is life-giving, bracing, but only on condition that each constituent is given a real place in the individual life. The whole life needs and requires all three constituents, and to be deprived of any is to be mutilated at worst, to be impoverished at least. Salt, seasoning, and savour are all requisite to a hungry man's wholesome meal: the three constituents are the salt, seasoning, and savour of a whole religious life of practice, thought, and feeling. The true conciliation of these constituents, therefore, is to be found, says our author, "in an even fuller conception of Personality, and of its primary place in the religious life." As "the human person begins more as a possibility than a reality . . . as the moral and spiritual character has to be built up slowly, painfully, laboriously . . . as the simply individual is transformed into the truly personal only by the successive sacrifice of the lower animal and impoverishingly selfish self . . . as conversion is perpetual . . . as intellectual exercise rests emotions, and as practice purifies them, and as emotions refresh and revivify the intellect and the will," so the institutional rests the intellectual, the mystical refreshes both, and the trinity of tendency historically perceived is realized to be true to the soul's own nature and harmonious growth.

Nevertheless, excess or defect will always characterize some souls, and the Baron enquires into the reason for this. He traces it to the longing of the religious temper for simplification, the yearning to find and to be satisfied with the One Thing

Necessary. A sublime simplicity characterizes all the Saints; away, then, with aught that threatens to disturb or destroy it. But, the answer comes inevitably in his thought, in the deepest unity, in the deepest simplicity lies also and always the deepest multiplicity, and in a finely observant passage he shows how in the sublime simplicity of Christ lies also a rich diversity, infinite riches in a little room. In a characteristic sentence lovingly built up phrase by phrase, fact by fact, he writes: "The astonishment at the disciples' slowness of comprehension, the flash of anger at Peter, the sad reproachfulness towards Judas, the love of the children, the sympathy with women, the pity towards the fallen, the indignation against the Pharisees, the rejoicing in the Father's revelation, the agony in the Garden, the desolation on the Cross, are all *different* emotions. The perception of the beauty of the flowers of the field, of the habits of plants and birds, of the varieties of the day's early and late cloud and sunshine, of the effects of storm and rain; and, again, of the psychology of various classes of character, age, and avocation; and, indeed, of so much more, are all *different* observations. The lonely recollection in the desert, the nights spent in prayer upon the mountain, the preaching from boats and on the lake-side, the long foot-journeyings, the many flights, the reading and expounding in the Synagogues, the curing of the sick and restoring them to their right mind, the driving the sellers from the Temple courts, and so much else, are all *different* activities."*

This great chapter closes with the consideration of and reply to three objections to his analysis. It might be objected that it is excessively intellectual. Intellectual, yes, but not excessively so, for he finely and generously means by intellectual any operation of *attention*, "hence the Venerable Anna Maria Taigi, the Roman working-man's wife, attending to the requirements and rules of good washing and of darning clothes," is in the same company as "St. Anselm and St. Thomas Aquinas toiling at their dialectic systems." And men of outstanding intellectual gifts are not *necessarily* thereby debarred from access to God; rather, they have a more responsible access, "for the intellectual virtues are no mere empty names . . . they bear upon them the impress of God and of His Christ"†; or, again, this analysis may be regarded as Pelagian, as leaving everything for man to do, to think, to feel, and nothing for God to do, to think, to feel? At once he replies religion always and necessarily implies the *Given*. No *true* religion, no worthful working religion is ever merely a subjective construction; God is given, not made by man's mind, the constant action of God's grace is implied

* *M. E.*, I. 67. † *M. E.*, II. 79.

throughout, and von Hügel is assured that in mature life we never really doubt this. Grace and Will rise and fall together; we are to pray as if all depends on the prayer and to act as if all depended on the action. But is this analysis Epicurean? "Is it not a masked Paganism rather than the nobly stern old Christianity?" Not at all, for the external and institutional, the daily round will provide crosses for every day, and within the secret places of the heart crosses too abound. So, he concludes: "Both at the beginning, throughout, and at the end of the soul's life the intellectual element is necessary, and this above all, for the planting fully and finally in the very depths of the personality, the Cross, the sole means to the soul's true Incoronation."*

C.—The remainder of the first volume of *The Mystical Element* is devoted to the biography of St. Catherine of Genoa and her friend, Battista Vernazza. This is not the place to attempt even to abbreviate that life. Suffice it to say that von Hügel, partly from personal attractions and partly by deliberate choice, chose the life of this Genoese lady to illustrate at every point his conception of the mystical element in religion. To English people who know hardly anything about her, her doctrine has come through Newman's *Dream of Gerontius*, in which is incorporated the gist of St. Catherine's treatise on Purgatory. She was of noble family, was born in 1447, was married to a young cadet of the Adorni family when she was only sixteen, and spent the first ten years of her married life partly in some solitude and mental suffering, partly in the usual distractions of a lady of position, until on March 30, 1473, she prayed that she might have three months sick in bed. Two days later, in the chapel of her sister's convent, she was overwhelmed by a "transport of pure and all-purifying love, and kept crying out within herself, 'No more world; no more sins!'" This simple but striking conversion was decisive: she made a general confession two days later; became a daily communicant from now onwards for thirty-seven years until her death. Six months later her bankrupt husband was converted, and husband and wife sold their country mansion, let their palace in Genoa, and moved into a little house outside a large hospital in the poorer quarter of the city. They still had a modest income left, but they resolved thenceforth to identify their lives with the sick and needy, and their compact was kept to the end. They also agreed to a life of perpetual continence, but although her husband became a Franciscan Tertiary, Catherine herself never joined any Religious Order even as a Tertiary. Severe external penances characterized her life for some years, and great fasts at Lent and Advent

* *M. E.*, I., c. ii. *fin.*

were practised for over twenty years. But her way of life, apart from the never-forsaken work in the hospital, gradually became more intensely interior, and expansive love and joy its marks. In 1479 Catherine and Guiliano took up their abode in the hospital itself, never again to leave it. She displayed high organizing and administrative talents during the plague of 1493. From 1499 her great fasts came to an end, and during the remaining ten years of her life her doctrine of Pure Love, of Purgatory, and of sympathy with animal and plant life was developed. In September, 1510, she died. She was canonized two hundred and sixteen years later, in 1737, together with St. Vincent de Paul. After his most careful, critical, and scholarly life of St. Catherine, von Hügel asks a question: "Wherein lies the secret of spiritual persuasiveness?" and his answer is in the ever-widening, ever-deepening growth and development of a personality. It is this growth and development, apparently so disproportionate to the simple events of her life, that draws the scholar to the saint; it is the operation through that life in its daily duties, its interior sufferings, its outbursts of ecstasy, its power of self-analysis, and of constructive teaching of the mystical element in religion, suffusing and enthusing that life throughout which enables von Hügel, her disciple in the twentieth century, to interpret his own experiences in the record of hers and to give in the second volume the ripe fruits of his reflexion. The seven long chapters of this volume include dissertations on the psycho-physical phenomena of St. Catherine's life; on the literary sources of her conceptions; on the relations between mysticism and pantheism, and supremely upon St. Catherine's teaching on purgatory, eternal punishment, evil, and on Pure Love or disinterested religion. These dissertations are in every and the best sense of the term learned, they are penetrating and delicately subtle, they are amazingly balanced, full of generous appreciations of opposing views and parties, and permeated throughout with a high constructive ideal, the advancement of the soul's true weal in balance, breadth, and beauty.

The most impressive of these chapters is that in which Quietism and the quietistic controversy are surveyed and analyzed. Nothing could be more admirable than the masterly and sympathetic treatment accorded to Fénelon. Nothing could be more skilful than his exposition of the doctrine of Pure Love (based upon the New Testament), and its careful distinction from what as Quietism was condemned. The causes of the defective analyses of the quietistic psychology are admirably elucidated; the four major aberrations of quietistic teaching are unflinchingly disclosed, and at the same time

the four needs recognized by and ministered unto by Quietism are as clearly stated.

Next to this noble critique comes an equally careful and learned summary of doctrines of the future life, and especially of St. Catherine's contributions to eschatology. How she simplified current and traditional teaching by stressing the symbolic but appropriately symbolic terms—fire of hell, fire of purgatory, fire and light of heaven: "The ray of God's mercy shines even in Hell," she says—and how her doctrine of purgatory has come to be increasingly helpful in these days, all this is weightily set forth. The book closes with an impressive iteration of the givenness of God and of the ever-necessary, ever-fruitful, ever bliss-producing Cross of Christ, the conviction summed up in "No cross, no crown."

III

From *The Mystical Element of Religion* von Hügel turns in his comprehensive study of *Eternal Life*, which appeared in 1913, to a restatement of the modern need for institutional religion. It might have been supposed from his exhaustive treatment of the mystical element that his appreciation of the institutional would have weakened. Not so, however. He recognizes the present decay of institutional religion, but he reaffirms its necessity in unmistakable terms. To condemn all external observances and institutions is inevitably to weaken and impoverish the interior life. In the twelfth chapter of the book he exhibits five pairs of contrasted strengths and weaknesses in institutionalism, and then selects four notable examples of the institutional and the mystical nourishing each other. It is here that we find some of his most generous and touching tributes to those who exercised a profound influence upon his own spiritual growth: he cites Mr. Montefiore's moving pages upon Prayer in his *Liberal Judaism ;* some of the sayings of the almost illiterate Curé of Ars, now canonized, St. Jean Vianney, and some of the aphorisms of the Abbé Huvelin, who, although equipped and competent for great scholarship, "preferred to write in souls" whilst occupying for thirty-five years an unpaid post in a large Parisian parish. In such souls living in and not abandoning the ordinances of institutional religion, says von Hügel, "we catch the clearest glimpses of what, for man even here below, can be and is Eternal Life."

But probably the busy man, anxious to gather to himself some of the Baron's ripest wisdom, will best do so from the third book, the volume of *Essays and Addresses*. There he will find eleven essays concerning religion in general, the teaching

of Jesus, and Catholicism generally. The essay on responsibility in religious belief administers some penetrating rebukes to those who think religion and belief do not matter. "It is not," he says, "it is not by denying as false what I do not yet see to be true that I have the chance of growing in insight." He reminds us of a great saying of St. Augustine: "posse non peccare, magna est libertas; non posse peccare maxima est"—"it is a great liberty to be able not to sin; it is a greater liberty not to be able to sin." The impossibility of satisfying our spiritual hunger in the non-social pursuits of art and poetry is forcibly brought out. In a fine and impassioned essay upon Christianity and the supernatural there is a noble, nay, a splendid defence of celibacy and of its profound efficiency when embraced as a vocation for ministering unto men. A very searching treatment of the question, "What do we mean by Heaven and what do we mean by Hell?" is not to be marred by attenuation or quotation, it is to be read, re-read, and lived. That von Hügel was not unmindful of the pressure upon simple souls of domestic bereavement and suffering may be seen in the private letter, reprinted in these essays, on religious belief and the facts of suffering faith and love. In this volume are gathered the fruits of what, in his dedication to Dante his fellow Florentine, he calls his own "sixty years of spiritual stress." One of the conceptions which he employs repeatedly in these essays is that of a scale of values wherein he finds himself able to accord a place for every great world religion, while at the same time he places near the summit Judaism as he viewed it in its majestic biblical record, and as he knew it in the gracious flowering of such lives as Mr. Montefiore's. But at the summit and excelling all other religions in organic richness, in meeting all the manifold needs of man's nature from its lowliest to its most splendid heights is Christianity, and, supremely, Catholic Christianity. For him the endless subdivisions of Protestantism meant solitary flowers where there might have been a garden. Even so, however, he would not deny the beauty of the solitary flowers. And he found several fundamental convictions common to both Catholic and Protestant Christianity, and shared in some respects by Judaism. For all three religion is given, not merely subjectively made. God is other than ourselves. "It is He that hath made us and not we ourselves. We are *His* people and the sheep of *His* pasture." For all three religion is necessarily expressed in a society, the company of the faithful, best of all expressed in the company of Jesus. For the whole world the Jewish-Christian revelation is unique; for all three—for Judaism, Catholicism, and Protestantism—religion is *also* a work, a labour, and a discipline for Man; for all three there is in religion

the possibility through grace of sanctity. In short, for all three religion is world-seeking, world-mingling, world-saving in the very act of fleeing from and saving oneself unspotted from the world. And in all the gold of religion as experienced by man there must be alloys, tried as by fire and purified in fire.

IV

What, then, may we say in conclusion? Here in the Baron von Hügel's work what permanent values are enshrined? I take them to be these: First, the threefold analysis of the constituents of any world religion—a permanent enrichment of our understanding. Second, the delineation of the specific genius of Catholicism set in relation to a delicate appreciation of other religious systems, a permanent contribution to that toleration which is understanding in the wise and sympathy in the ignorant. Third, the steady maintenance of the note of joy, of bliss as ultimate in the Divine Nature with a full recognition of the Cross, of suffering as the law of approach from the finite individual to the infinite Person in God: a permanent bulwark against all insidiously sentimental exaggerations of patripassianism. On the *earth* the broken arc, in the *heavens* the perfect round. Fourth, a rare realization that in affirmation there is life, in blank negation there is death, affirmation standing for growth, blank negation for decay, a Carlylean acceptance of the everlasting yea. Fifth, the justest estimate of the obligations of both the married and the celibate states; a permanent witness from one called to the first to the reality of vocation to the second. Sixth, a never-failing appreciation of the distinction between origins and validity: a permanent protest against all merely genetic methods.

But those outstanding values of his work would not mean what they do mean and will mean to his readers were it not that throughout his every page there beats the strong pulse of a passionate sincerity, the strong pulse of a passionate desire for synthesis; throughout there glows at white heat the passionate conviction of the objectivity of God.

Yet, as he well knew must be the case, in his work are defects, omissions, faults. His work is admittedly and intentionally for advanced souls in advanced states of spiritual experience. He remains the writer's writer, the thinker's thinker. By other hands must be wielded the pen that will write for the multitude: and he would be as generous and just in his appreciation of their work as we must be of his. There is in his work a strange neglect of modern English poetry: he failed to utilize, if indeed he knew, the rich illustrations of the mystical element of religion

to be found in Wordsworth's poetry. A Catholic of the Catholics and fifty years' resident in England, he exhibits no knowledge or appreciation of the work of Coventry Patmore, Francis Thompson, and Mrs. Meynell; had he only known how that work fits in with those treatises of St. Catherine, St. Teresa and St. John of the Cross which he knew so well, his work would have had a homelier, a less alien sound; and although in *Eternal Life* he has a chapter on Socialism, it cannot be said that he was seized by social questions in such a way as to make his religious philosophy bear pertinently and practically on the call to be up and doing for the social service of our day. These defects, however, are contributing and not detracting factors in the essential greatness of his work: alloy that hardens and brightens his gold.

To have seen him was to catch a glimpse of Jewish prophet and of mediæval priest-theologian; to have heard him was to hear as it were the sound of many waters; to have talked with him was to be stripped of the false, the feeble, and the petty, to be healed, to be cleansed, and to be braced to a manly converse with the Saints.

ALBERT A. COCK.

THE IDEA OF MAN IN ATHANASIUS

THE view put forward by Athanasius on the nature of man and his relation to God is suggested by two considerations—one historical and theological, the other personal and practical. To the Alexandrian tradition he brings his own peculiar conviction of the meaning of sin in human life. He had been taught that the Eternal Word is the pivot of the round world and of them that dwell therein: for to Him the whole owes its existence and its destiny. It was for us men and for our salvation that the Word became flesh. But what if humanity has fallen to lower depths than Clement or Origen imagined? What if the eternal spark in man's heart has been all but quenched beyond recovery of being fanned into flame? What if the course of sin initiated by Adam has been cutting its way more and more deeply into the race? What if sin is more than either ignorance or wilfulness, describable only as living death? Athanasius believes that men were wasting away in decay, and that if the process was to be arrested, a living antidote must needs enter into them and stay the plague. Sin is a power to be overcome. Hence he makes incessant appeal to the teaching of Holy Scripture in support of the positive nature of sin, and of its destruction by the Word who became flesh in order to meet and overcome it on its own ground.

Athanasian psychology is governed by the anthropology of the introduction to the Book of Genesis, overlaid with Platonism and enriched by New Testament ideas drawn chiefly from St. Paul. On the one hand, the breath of life is understood as the gift of immortal reason; on the other hand, man, considered as a natural animal, is a being doomed to decay because of the perishable character of his material origin. Mind, therefore, is not so much an organization of mental processes as a combination of two heterogeneous entities, one rational and immortal, the other irrational and perishable.* No doubt the two can enter into harmonious relation, the more worthy steering the body's instinctive and impulsive activities through the course of time; but in man's fallen condition the lower element easily elects to flit from reaction to reaction regardless of the immortal blessedness intended for it by the Creator.

Man as we experience him is not the immediate product of God: in the beginning he and his environment were good. The world around him is a mixture of four elements—heat, cold, wet, and dry—and it remains a comparatively settled totality because of the Word's ever-abiding Providence. It would pass into the nothingness whence it came without the co-ordinating power of the Word.† To the perishable world of finitude Adam's animal nature belonged, and God raised him above it by imparting to him an additional grace, the gift of reason, in the exercise of which he might learn something of God and His ways.‡ Had Adam developed this potential gift and obeyed the law which it revealed, the corruption natural to his lower nature would have been stayed, and death would not have been his lot. The rival possibilities open to him are stated by Athanasius when he writes that " man is by nature mortal, inasmuch as he is made out of what is not; but by reason of His likeness to Him that is (and if he still preserved this likeness by keeping Him in his knowledge) he would stay his natural corruption, and remain incorrupt."§ Adam was created innocent but imperfect. His task was the organization of his instinctive propensities, for his grace is " without " and is " not united to the body."‖ This he failed to do, and instead freely embraced, at the devil's suggestion, the things of sense to which his lower nature was akin. Whereupon he came under the curse of death ordained by God to be his punishment.¶ He relapsed into the condition natural to him at the initial stage of his career, but the penal mortality differs from the first mortality out of which God

* *Contra Gentes*, iii. 41, 1.
† *Ibid.* iii. 42, 1-2; *Orationes contra Arianos*, i. 8, 29; 13, 58.
‡ *Contra Gentes*, i. 2; *De Incarnatione*, 3.
§ *De Incarn.*, 4, 6. ‖ *Orat.*, ii. 21, 68; i. 12, 51.
¶ *Contra Gentes*, 3; *De Incarn.*, 6; *Orat.*, ii. 21, 65.

had raised him in two respects. In the first place, death is not simply death, for it carries with it a sting and a curse; and, secondly, though the immortal element of reason remains in him as a power capable of cultivation it is utterly unable to assert its authority over his unruly members or to arrest the process of decay to which they have become subject.*

Human nature, therefore, as it left the hand of the Creator is not the human nature we experience in ourselves and in other men. Originally, in its first representative, it is perfect after its kind and enjoys the privilege of being able to develop towards complete perfection, the fullest knowledge of God, a reward which renders it immortal and divine. But the other potentiality is allowed to develop in the first parent, and is handed down to posterity as an actuality. Mortality, having repudiated the potentiality of immortality, begets mortality. Adam bequeathed to all who came after a corrupt nature, because parents necessarily transmit to their offspring something of their own material substance,† which, having forfeited the transforming spiritual power given it by God, is naturally inclined to evil. An originated creature is biased to choose the evil in place of the good.‡ The very act of procreation to which he owes his birth was "passible," an emotional condition not permissible to rational beings made after the image of God.§ Here already in Athanasius we discern the seeds of what in its full-blown form in St. Augustine we are accustomed to put down to Manichean influence.

Athanasius has nothing very new to say about the psychology of sin: his analysis of the condition into which souls have fallen, save that it becomes progressively worse, is similar to that of his Alexandrian predecessors. The rational element ought to mediate between God, whose image it is, and its lower partner; and by communion with Him ought to catch the ideal harmony which makes a soul good, and in turn impose this harmony upon the bodily members by gradually co-ordinating them into complementary functions.‖ "For as the strings of the lyre have each its proper note—high, low, or intermediate, sharp or otherwise—yet their scale is indistinguishable and their time not to be recognized without the artist. For then only is the scale manifest and the time right, when he that is holding the lyre strikes the strings and touches each in tune. In like manner the senses, being disposed in the body like a lyre when the skilled intelligence presides over them, then, too, the soul distinguishes and knows what it is doing and how it is acting."¶ In a passage

* *Contra Gentes*, 34; *De Incarn.*, 5, 1; 6, 2; 44, 2.
† *De Decretis*, iii. 11. ‡ *Orat.*, i. 12, 52. § *Ibid.*, i. 8, 28.
‖ *Contra Gentes*, ii. 31, 1; iii. 43, 1. ¶ *Ibid.*, ii. 31, 4.

of singular beauty Athanasius insists that man has within him an ever-abiding nexus between him and God, even though he may lack the power to bring it into action. "Neither, as God Himself is above all, is the road to Him afar off or outside ourselves, but it is in us, and it is possible to find it from ourselves. . . . We have all set foot upon it, and have it, even if we are not willing to travel by it, but rather to swerve from it and go wrong, because of the pleasures of life which attract them from without. And if one were to ask, what road is this? I say that it is the soul of each one of us, and the intelligence which resides there. For by it alone can God be contemplated and perceived."* But sinners have lost the power to concentrate on the good that God suffered them to retain. The attention, instead of fixing on the Word within, allows itself to be attracted and held by objective stimuli from the outer world, and in these reactions men tend more and more to find their pleasures—and their good.† Environment presents such a varied set of attractions to souls now become almost passive that they lose more and more the co-ordinating power of intelligence and wander in many directions.‡ In their unsystematized sentiments centring round material objects the emotion of fear is dominant, and it dooms its victims to live under the apprehension that some day these objects may be withdrawn from their reach. That is why men fear to die: they fear separation from the things that have claimed them for their own.§

Psychology, as Athanasius saw clearly, may describe the effects of sin, and it may afford help in the practical process of self-training that the repentant sinner must undertake; but it cannot explain its origin, and it cannot destroy its power. Mere wrong-doing, whether of defect or excess, becomes sin only when it is viewed in relation to God. Psychology is an abstraction from a greater whole, and the analysis it offers requires to be synthesized with another element in man which Aristotle says is "from without," and St. James says is "from above." When this larger field is brought within our survey, man has to be interpreted in the light of the whole cosmos: we begin to speak of him as a spiritual being, an image of God. He has to be brought into relations with factors in his environment more fundamental than the social and the material; and when he is seen as a diseased fallen being, incapable of entering upon so comprehensive a life, he must be healed, raised, re-created. He must bring his ruined remains to his Creator, and pray that he may be created all over again—rather his loving Creator

* *Contra Gentes*, ii. 30, 1-3.
† *Ibid.*, i. 4, 1.
‡ *Ibid.*, i. 23, 5.
§ *Ibid.*, i. 3, 4.

will first approach him and effect these things with him, for him, and in him. "The Word became flesh." Man is in sin: he is dead—dead under a curse; he is ignorant—morally foolish. God, who cannot die, takes a body that can die and gives it over to death in his stead: God, who is Wisdom, bestows illumination upon him. Origen stated what Clement before him had failed to see; but it remained to Athanasius to embrace in one synthesis these two truths, the Biblical and the Greek. Christ's death and Christ's influence are one—the flesh is the flesh of the Word. "The Word became flesh" to overcome sin: He effects His purpose by destroying the death to which it inevitably led, and by enlightening the minds of sinners who have steeped themselves in the follies of sense perception. The Saviour who saved the world by ascending the cross is the Word of God.*

We shall take the two moments separately, when it will be clear that Athanasius regards the first as the condition of the second. Christ dies for man, and having died for him He can interpenetrate him. The Word became man, and the human element incorporated in the Word does not reach its perfect work until it proves itself raised to the higher plane of immortality. The fulfilment of the Incarnation is marked by the Resurrection of the Word's incorruptible humanity. As St. Paul taught, Calvary results in Pentecost because Easter intervenes.

First, Christ died, or rather He submitted to a violent death.† The human nature assumed by Him at the Incarnation was of one stuff with ours, save in being sinless,‡ and it becomes, through the indwelling power of the Word, whose instrument it is, immortal human nature.§ Whereas Origen said that the Word had taken to Himself in the eternal and heavenly sphere a stainless human nature to be His saving and illuminating instrument on earth, Athanasius looks upon the human instrument as part and parcel of the sphere in which human nature had its rise and fall.‖ Christ died a human death. This death is, first, a vicarious sacrifice, for Christ offers His human nature in our stead to the Father, or to death, the penalty laid upon human nature by the Father.¶ It was prefigured by the sacrifices of the old dispensation, to which Athanasius assigns an educative value. "By Moses, then, God gave commandment respecting sacrifices, and all the book called Leviticus is entirely taken up with the arrangement of these matters, so that He might accept the offerer."** Aaron's sacrificial robes were the insignia of a temporal mediation between the Hebrews and God: the mediation of Christ is eternal and universal. "The Word

* *Contra Gentes*, i. 1, 5.
† *De Incarn.*, 21, 5.
‡ *Ibid.*, 8, 3.
§ *Ibid.*, 20, 4.
‖ *Orat.*, iii. 20, 56.
¶ *De Incarn.* 8, 4.
** *Ep.*, xix., 3.

was made High Priest, by putting on a body which was originate and made, and such as He can offer for us."* Secondly, Christ's death is a redemption. Once upon a time the Word brought the Hebrews up out of Egypt, now He has " redeemed all of us, or rather, the whole race from death, and brought them up from the grave."† It is from death, sin, and corruption, not from the devil, that we are redeemed.‡ Thirdly, Christ's death is a ransom for the sins of the whole world: the cost of our redemption lies in the self-offering of His perfect righteousness.§ " If the Lord's death is the ransom of all, and by His death ' the middle wall of partition ' is broken down, and the calling of the nations is brought about, how would He have called us to Him, had He not been crucified ? For it is only on the cross that a man dies with his hands spread out. Whence it was fitting for the Lord to bear this also and to spread out His hands, that with the one He might draw the ancient people, and with the other those from the Gentiles, and unite both in Himself."‖ Lastly, Christ's death is the equivalent of the debt of death which the whole race owes to God.¶

Already we have intimated that there are two moments in the work of Christ for men, His death and His inspiring power. The transition to the second may be logically made by dwelling for a moment upon the relation of Christ to the men for whom He became incarnate. He died for them, offering as their High Priest the sacrifice of His perfect human nature to God, that He might ransom them from death, sin, and corruption. For this work of mediation He has a unique qualification; for when as Eternal Wisdom he gave men the gift of intelligence He imparted to them a power like His Wisdom, in virtue of which they are images or reflections of Him. And when in the fulness of time He enters into human relations with these quasi-rational men and becomes the Jesus of History He is their brother.** He had always influenced them from above: now He can work for them on their own level of existence. His sinless and obedient humanity is a new power come among them.†† Commenting on 1 Cor. iii. 10-11, Athanasius writes: " And it must be that the foundation should be such as the things built on it, that they may admit of being well compacted together. Being then the Word, He has not, as Word, any such as Himself, who may be compacted with Him; for He is Only-begotten; but having become man, He has the like of Him, those namely the likeness of whose flesh He has put on. Therefore according to His man-

* *Orat.*, ii. 4, 8.
‡ *Orat.*, i. 11, 45.
‖ *Ibid.*, 25, 3.
** *Orat.*, ii. 14, 9; 15, 16.
† *Ep.*, x. 10.
§ *De Incarn.*, 40, 2.
¶ *Ibid.*, 9, 1; *Orat.*, ii. 21, 66.
†† *Ibid.*, iii. 29, 57.

hood He is founded, that we, as precious stones, may admit of building upon Him, and may become a temple of the Holy Ghost who dwelleth in us. And as He is a foundation, and we stones built upon Him, so again He is a Vine and we knit to Him as branches, not according to the Essence of the Godhead; for this surely is impossible; but according to His manhood, for the branches must be like the vine, since we are like Him according to the flesh."* Moberly echoes this Athanasian truth when he thinks of Christ as "inclusively" man; but the older way of expressing it is to say that what the Word did in His own humanity He did potentially in all men.

We may say, then, that the Christ who died for us is related to us in two ways: first, because the highest element of our nature, reason, is a reflection of His Divine nature; secondly, because our nature as a whole is akin to His human nature. But the Christ who rose from the dead for us bears a third relation to us: He has become our First Fruits; "not that He died before us, for we had died first; but because having undergone death for us and abolished it, He was the first to rise, as man, for our sakes raising His own Body. Henceforth He having risen, we too from Him and because of Him rise in due course from the dead."† Before Bethlehem He worked from above upon man's conscience; after Bethlehem He intensified that influence by bringing Himself into contact with man's senses —through His voice, His touch, His human form; now He draws man to Himself through the power of His immortal humanity which meets us in the power of Sacrament as well as in conscience and in the works of nature. The often quoted passage from the Letter to Serapion emphasizes this third and new grace clearly. In it he explains John vi. 62-64 as follows: "For here also He has used both terms of Himself, flesh and spirit; and He distinguished the spirit from what is of the flesh in order that they might believe not only in what was visible in Him, but in what was invisible, and so understand that what He says is not fleshly, but spiritual. For how many would the body suffice as food, for it to become meat even for the whole world? But this is why He mentioned the ascending of the Son of Man into heaven—namely, to draw them off from their corporeal idea, and that from thenceforth they might understand that the aforesaid flesh was heavenly from above, and spiritual meat, to be given at His hands. For 'what I have said unto you,' says He, 'is spirit and life'; as much as to say, 'what is manifested, and to be given for the salvation of the world, is the flesh which I wear. But this, and the blood from

* *Orat.*, ii., 22, 74.
† *Ibid.*, ii., 21, 61; *De Incarn.* 8, 4; *Orat.*, ii., 22, 81.

it, shall be given to you spiritually at My hands as meat, so as to be imparted spiritually in each one, and to become for all a preservative to resurrection of life eternal." The Word's sojourn in the flesh deified the flesh, and raised it to the level of immortality, and the vindication of that new immortality was the transition from the Cross to the Resurrection and Ascension. On the Cross His humanity met death and was apparently conquered by it, only to conquer it in return. Until His humanity had reversed the death penalty which it had voluntarily accepted, it had not passed into eternity.* After the Resurrection His humanity received new power,† and was exalted into heaven, whence our gifts come.‡

The grace of the Resurrection is bestowed upon us through the Holy Ghost who abides in us and in whom we are said to be "begotten" in contrast with our first birth when we were "made."§ But since "whatever the Spirit hath, He hath from the Word," we are indwelt by the Word whose images we are.‖ Dwelling in us He becomes the Central Object of our attention, and we learn gradually to divert our selfish gaze from things of sense. United with Him we are immortal, and though our bodies must be dissolved in due course no curse attaches to a death we do not fear, and we shall be raised again by the power of His Resurrection.¶ With us there will be raised also all those who with us in Him have been recreated. His Ascended Manhood is one with all men, and it is the Corner-stone with which all other stones are to be compacted.** The excellences which we as members of the Church exchange among ourselves are His gifts—gifts to members of the Body for members of the Body.††

Athanasius offers no speculations on the nature of "the end": he believes that Christ will come again to render to every man according to his works. The works for which He looks and works are characters in whom He shall see Himself reflected. God the Father ever rejoices in His Word, and when He rejoices in men He rejoices in those who offer to Him the values which the Word has created in them.‡‡

W. C. DE PAULEY.

* *Orat.*, ii. 20, 55.
† *Ibid.*, iii. 27, 39-40.
‡ *Ibid.*, iv. 6.
§ *Ibid.*, ii. 21, 59; iii. 25, 24.
‖ *Ibid.*, iii., 25, 10.
¶ *De Incarn.*, 21, 1.
** *Orat.*, ii. 22, 74.
†† *Ibid.*, iii. 25, 19.
‡‡ *Ibid.*, ii. 22, 82.

REFLECTIONS OF A RUSSIAN PHILOSOPHER ON JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY

Dostoevsky said once in his famous speech at the Poet Poushkin festival, in 1880, that the chief characteristic of the Russian people, which is so strongly expressed in Poushkin's genius, is the ability to grasp the spirit and ideas of alien nations —a sympathetic understanding of the opinions of others. The intimate friend of Dostoevsky, the philosopher Soloviov, possessed this gift to an extraordinary extent. This great Christian thinker could almost identify himself with the persecuted Jews of Russia. He constantly fought against the anti-Jewish legislation of the Czarist Government. His " Protest against the anti-semitic movement in the Press " ends with the following prophetic words:

" The anti-semitic movement must be condemned, not only because it is immoral and wicked, but *because it is extremely dangerous for the future of Russia.*"

In the mutual relationships between Jews and Christians Soloviov observed the following fact: The Jews have treated the Christians " jewishly," but the Christians have not treated the Jews " christianly." If we do not keep Christ's Gospel of Love in relation to Jews, then they are justified in asserting that the " Gospel of Love " is the Gospel of a mere visionary.

But have not the Jews crucified Christ ? And are they not still His greatest enemies ? Soloviov's reply was: " It is true that the majority of those who cried ' Crucify Him ! Crucify Him !' were Jews, but it is also true that the thousands who listened to the preaching of St. Peter, and who became the first members of the Christian Church, were Jews. Anna and Caiphas were Jews, but so were Joseph and Nicodemus. To the same people belong Judas the traitor, who delivered the Messiah to death on the Cross, as well as Peter and Andrew, who for Christ's sake were themselves crucified. A Jew was Thomas, who at first did not believe in the Resurrection, and who did not cease to be a Jew after he had seen the Risen One, and said to Him, ' My Lord and my God.' Saul of Tarsus, the cruel persecutor of the Christians, was a Jew, and a typical Jew remained Paul the Apostle, who for Christ's sake did suffer all things. And what is more important than all that, Our Lord Himself was a perfect Jew after the flesh and after His human Soul."

" Is it not remarkable," asks Soloviov, " that we, facing this tremendous fact, persecute the Jews in the name of Christ ?

If Christ is not what He claimed to be, then the Jews have no greater responsibility than the Greeks had for killing Socrates; but if we believe that Christ is the Incarnate Logos, we must consider the Jewish people as the Divine instrument of the Incarnation. For His Death, the Romans, as well as the Jews, are responsible, but for His Birth, God and the Jews only."

Why was the Catholic Church of Christ founded in Judea? In other words, Why did God choose the Jewish people to become the people of the Messiah? There must be some moral foundation for His choice. True freedom does not exclude reason; this choice represents the relationship between God and Israel, and, after all, every choice is conditioned, not only by the character of the chooser, but also by the quality of the chosen. No one can deny that the national character of the Jews shows an inner unity; yet in it we find three fundamental characteristics which appear to contradict each other.

1. The Jews are marked by a deep religious sense which often culminates in self-sacrifice for God's sake. They are the people of the Law and the Prophets, of the martyrs and Apostles, "who through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions."

2. Extreme self-consciousness is another of their national features. Every Jew is deeply permeated by the consciousness of his individual worth as a Jew.

3. Another characteristic is his extreme materialism, in the wider sense of the word. Soloviov finds a symbol for this in the Hebrew alphabet, which consists only of consonants, the body of words; whilst the spirit (the vowels) is either totally absent, or merely suggested by dots and dashes.

Thus, the character of this peculiar people is composed of a *Divine* element, which reveals itself in the religion of the Jews; of *human* energy, which expresses itself in the national, personal, and family life of the Jews; and of an inclination to materialism. But in which way do all these self-contradictory elements unite in *one* national individuality? One should expect that the perfect attachment to God would, if not paralyze, at least weaken, the human interest in worldly affairs, as for instance is the case in Brahmanism. Again, the extreme development of the human element—of humanism in one form or another—should, on the one hand, weaken the religious feeling, and, on the other hand, free the human spirit from crude materialism, as we see it, for instance, in the best representatives of ancient Greece and modern Europe.

And yet, in Judaism all these contradictory traits are harmoniously united, without in any way disturbing the unity

of the national character. In order to find the key to the solution of this riddle we must not be content to dwell on the abstract conceptions of religion, idealism, and materialism *in general*, but study the peculiarity of *Jewish* religion, *Jewish* humanism, and *Jewish* materialism. It is true that the Jew believed in *one* God, but that does not mean an absorption in the Deity, in a pantheistic sense. The Cabbalistic pantheism and the philosophy of Spinoza are exceptions. Generally speaking, Judaism conceived God not as an endless vacuum of a general substratum, but as an endless fullness of a Person who contains all life in Himself, communicating it to all. Free from all limitations, the true God is not merely immanent in the world, but also transcendent, manifesting Himself as the perfect Personality, the absolute Ego. In harmony with this conception of the Divine Personality, religion cannot mean an absorption of human personality in the Deity; on the contrary, it is the expression of the personal, mutual activity between God and Man. It was because of this conception of God and of religion, that Israel could become the chosen people of God. The true God made Israel His people because Israel also made the true God his God. God elected them, revealed Himself to them, made a Covenant with them. The Covenant-relationship between God and Israel is the centre of the Jewish religion. This Covenant was conceived as between two, if not equally powerful, yet ethically co-equal personalities. This high conception of man does not weaken the greatness of God; on the contrary, it gives Him the possibility of revealing Himself in His whole power. In the independent ethical character of man God finds an object worthy of Himself. If man were not a free personality how could God reveal His personal character in the world? In so far as the transcendent personal God is higher than the impersonal phenomena of Nature, the religion of Israel is of an entirely different calibre from the naturalistic and pantheistic religions of the ancient East. Neither God nor man in these religions claims independence; man is a slave of strange and unknown powers, and the Deity is merely a pure plaything of human phantasy, as, for instance, in Greek mythology. Not so in the religion of Israel. Christianity begins with the personal relationship between God and man in the Old Covenant, and it culminates in the close personal union of God and man in the New Covenant through Jesus Christ, in Whom both natures are inseparably one. These two Covenants are not two different religions, but two phases of one and the same religion—of God-manhood—or to use a more abstract expression, two moments of one and the same Divine-human process. This one, true, Divine-human, Jewish-Christian religion steps majestically

between two extreme perversions of Religion: Brahminism on the one hand, where human personality is absorbed in the Deity; and Greek and Roman mythology on the other hand, where the gods are mere reflections of men. The true God Who chose Israel and was chosen by them, is a powerful God, an absolute God, a holy God. The strong God chooses to Himself a strong man who can fight with Him; the perfect Personality reveals Itself only to a self-conscious personality; the Holy God unites Himself only with one who seeks holiness, and is capable of an active, moral heroism. Human weakness seeks God's strength, but it is the weakness of a strong man—a man who is by nature weak is not capable of a strong religion. Equally, a non-personal, characterless man with a poorly developed self-consciousness, cannot comprehend the Truth of the true God. Finally, a man in whom the freedom of ethical self-determination is paralyzed, who is not able to begin an action consciously, who is not capable of performing an heroic action, to attain holiness—to such a man, God's Holiness will always remain something external and foreign—he will never become a " friend of God." Thus, the genuine religion of Israel, far from hindering the development of a free human personality, on the contrary *promotes* self-consciousness and energy in man.

Israel was great in faith. But a great faith demands great spiritual powers. The energy of a free humanity expresses itself first in faith. The popular idea that *faith* suppresses the freedom of the human spirit, and that *knowledge*, on the other hand, widens this freedom, is absolutely wrong. In faith, the human spirit transcends the limitation of the visible reality. It affirms the reality of the *invisible*—a reality which cannot be rationally apprehended. True faith is the heroic act of the spirit, " which searches all things, yea, the deep things of God." The believing spirit does not wait passively for the influence of phenomena on him, but goes out bravely to meet them; he does not follow slavishly the phenomena, but precedes them. It is free and independent. " Blessed are those who do not see, and yet believe." In the empiric knowledge, on the contrary, our spirit, by subjecting itself to external facts, is passive and unfree; here, there is no action, no moral merit. Naturally, the contrast between faith and knowledge is not an absolute one. The believer *knows* the Object of his faith, and, on the other hand, scientific knowledge is often founded on faith, on something that cannot be proven empirically—for instance, the objective reality of the physical world, the continuity of natural laws, the undeceptiveness of our mental judgements. Nevertheless, it is without doubt that in religion *activity* and *freedom* predominate, but in the domain of empirical knowledge—*passivity* and *dependence*.

The acknowledgment of a fact coming to us from without does not require the independence and energy of the human spirit; but the realization of something which has not, as yet, become a sensuous, tangible, visible fact requires the energy of the whole personality. The thing which is before our eyes *forces* us to acknowledge its existence; but the power of the spirit consists in this—that we can by intuition see what is coming, recognize what is hidden and mysterious. Just because of this, the highest energy of the human spirit reveals itself in the prophets of Israel, not *in spite* of their faith, but *because* of it.

This union of a deep faith in God with the highest concentration of human energy has been preserved also in *later* Judaism. How sharply, for instance, is this expressed in the last prayer of the Easter ritual, in which the longing for the coming of the Messiah is voiced:

"Almighty God, create soon Thy Temple, soon—in our days—as soon as possible—build it now—build it to-day, build soon Thy Temple. Good God, great God, mild God, high God, merciful God, sweetest God, immeasurable God, God of Israel, in the nearest time build Thy Temple. Soon—soon—in our days—build it now, build it soon, Thy Temple. Almighty God, living God, strong God, God full of praises, merciful God, eternal God, fearful God, perfect God, omnipotent God, rich God, majestic God, faithful God, now—soon—build Thy Temple. Soon—soon—in our days—soon—now—build—build now, now—soon—build Thy Temple."

In this remarkable prayer we note, apart from the sincere faith in the God of Israel and the stubbornness of the human will, a characteristic peculiarity. The worshippers do not desire that their God should remain in the transcendent sphere. Seeing in Him the ideal of every perfection, they demand the embodiment of this ideal on *earth*. They pray that God should reveal Himself visibly, that He should create a Temple to Himself, the material dwelling-place of His power and His glory—and that this Temple should be built now—"as soon as possible." In this impatient longing to see the Divine realized on earth we can find the explanation of the Jewish this-worldliness, their materialistic outlook. There are three different types of materialism: the practical, the philosophical, and the religious. The first means the predominance of the lower human nature over the higher, of the animal instincts over reason, of the sensuous interests over the spiritual. In order to justify the power of the animal nature in his life, the practical materialist seeks to deride the existence of everything which cannot be grasped by this lower nature. He denies everything that cannot be seen or heard, touched, weighed, or measured. In making this denial a general principle this practical materialism becomes a theoretical or a philosophic system. These two kinds of

materialism are not characteristic of the Jews. Jewish materialism is *religious* materialism, or, rather, realism. For every idea and every ideal the Jew demands a visible and touchable materialization. He cannot acknowledge an ideal which has no power to subdue under it every activity of life. He is capable and prepared to acknowledge the highest spiritual truth, but only on condition that he should at the same time see and feel its real working. He believes in the invisible (for every belief is a belief in the invisible), but he desires that this invisible might become visible and reveal its power; that it should permeate everything material, and use the material as a medium and an instrument. Israel saw in material Nature the not-yet-finished dwelling-place of the Divine-human spirit, and paid the greatest attention to it, but not in order to worship it, but rather to worship *in* it, and *through* it, the Creator. The idea of the materialization of the spiritual, "The Word becoming Flesh," played, in the religion of Israel, a much more important rôle than in any other religion. One can say that the whole religious history of the Jews was directed towards preparing for the God of Israel not alone holy souls, but also holy bodies. Therefore the Jewish people formed the genuine environment for the Incarnation of the Divine Logos, for which not only a holy, virginal soul was necessary, but also a holy, pure body.

Thus, these three characteristics form *one* unity in the religion of Israel. The true Israelite did not desire anything else than that the Object of his faith should make use of the whole fullness of reality and permeate it. Then, too, the purely human longing for action could not be satisfied with abstract ideas and ideals, but expected the real incarnation of the ideas, so that the spiritual demands should entirely dominate the material life. The religious materialism of the Jews is not rooted in unbelief—on the contrary, it springs out of a fullness of faith which pants after activity. The religious materialism has its origin not in the *weakness* of the human spirit but in its *strength* and *energy;* which is not afraid to defile itself by coming into contact with matter, which it purifies and uses for its religious aims. In this way these three fundamental characteristics of the Jewish people, in their co-operation, contributed to the realization of the work of God in Israel. The firm belief in the true God made the manifestation of God, and His revelation in Israel, possible. By believing at the same time in themselves and their mission, Israel was able to enter into a personal relationship with Yahveh, to speak with Him face to face, to enter into a Covenant with Him, to serve Him, not merely as a passive instrument, but as an active ally, and, when the

fullness of time came, Israel was able to prepare, in her midst, a pure and holy place for the Incarnation of the Logos.

Therefore the Jews became the people of the Messiah. However, only when the free faith in the living God takes the first place, does Jewish self-consciousness, as well as Jewish materialism, serve God's cause and promote the establishment of true Theocracy. But, as soon as these two purely human qualities of the Jewish character hold sway over the religious element, and as soon as the latter becomes subordinate to the former, we see before us the traditional, caricatured Jewish type with its deformed features; which explains, if not excuses, the general antipathy towards Judaism. The national self-consciousness torn from its Divine element becomes mere Chauvinism; the realism of the Jewish spirit is then perverted into mere Mammonism, which hides the features of true Judaism from foreign, prejudiced eyes.

Christianity appears to the Jews, in so far as it means the Gospel of universal brotherhood, as something indefinite, abstract, unreal. On the other hand, since Christianity connects the work of the world-redemption exclusively with the Person of Jesus, it seems to the Jews to be something narrow and impossible. In any case, the practical and realistic Jew considers Christianity as something unrealizable and therefore false. That it should be possible to gather all round the One, and through the One, to unite each with all, is incomprehensible to him. The Jews can be convinced of the Truth which is in Christ only through action. The more perfectly the Christian world expresses the Christian idea of a spiritual and universal Theocracy, the more powerfully this idea works in the life of the individual, in the social life of Christian peoples, in the political relationships of Christian nations among themselves, the more will the Jews be convinced of the reality of Christ and His Gospel, and "Wisdom will be justified by her children."

Thus the *Jewish* question is really a *Christian* question.

PAUL P. LEVERTOFF.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A LAY-READER writes with regard to the article on Parochial Visiting published in our March issue: "I well remember one day knocking at a door, and a woman answered; and after I had spoken a few kind words, she burst into tears. I said, 'Why do you weep?' She answered, 'Those are the first kind words I have had spoken to me for the last month.'"

A SERVICE OF DEVOTION

(Communicated.)

IT was fortunately a fine night, when I set out to find the Mission Church of which my friend and former pupil at College was in charge. I had been there twenty years or so back, and so had a general notion of where it lay in that wilderness of slums; but I had to interrogate many policemen before I found one who knew just where it was pitched. The streets were dark, too, once one left the tram-lines, and in that ugly paper-ridden garb which they wear before the scavengers come round. But at last I emerged on a cleaner, quieter spot: a party of boys knew all about the Mission Church, and one of them courteously left the group to show me to the door.

The service had begun at 9, and I was a few minutes late. There had been a hymn, and one of the clergy was giving an address, standing in the nave, with one foot on a pew. The lights were dimmed—for the congregation is not rich—but I could discern a number of figures seated intently listening to the discourse. It was simple and direct—the appeal of the Cross as the great manifestation of God's love for men, and of what it cost Him; could we, for whom He gave all, give less than our all in return? I was reminded of a letter I had had a week earlier from a friend, lamenting how widely teaching about the Sacraments had supplanted the message of the Cross in our churches to-day; and I wished he had been with me. Then followed a hymn; and as the lights were turned up, I could see the company more clearly—seventy or eighty people, and of all sorts, but mostly young, with a good sprinkling of stalwart young men. That is the usual number, the Vicar told me, on these Wednesday evenings.

During the hymn the candles behind the altar were lit—twenty-nine of them, unless I counted wrong, and they made a bright, warm glow; and the atmosphere seemed to become more tense, and charged with a kind of expectancy. As the last verse was sung, my friend went to the vestry, put on a short surplice, and came and took his station on the sanctuary step with a thurifer bearing the censer at his side. He did not move from that position throughout the rest of the service. And there began at once one of the most beautiful pieces of devotional teaching I have ever heard. It was a meditation on the appearance of our Lord in the upper room, when He came to convince St. Thomas. I cannot reproduce it; but I felt that I knew better than I had ever known before what St. John was driving at. The whole thought was perfectly proportioned, the sacramental Presence grounded in and fused with the Presence "in the midst," and a clear ethical note sounding through it all. "The living

Christ "—that was the main theme—" present in His Church, present in the hearts of His people, present in the Holy Sacrament." Surely this was the atmosphere in which the records of the Resurrection appearances were written ?

The Meditation ended, we sang two Eucharistic hymns, which the people knew by heart; and then a great hush, as the priest said: " Let us ask, in silence, for the blessing of our Lord." The sacring bell was rung to mark the beginning and the end of this silent climax of the service. Wonderful moments they were—moments that gathered up all our teaching about the Cross, and our thoughts on the risen ever-living Lord, and turned them into an act of trusting, yearning, and adoring love. Then the Divine Praises (in its full Trinitarian form) and an evening hymn and the memorial of the departed; and our joint worship was over. But there was no hustling of departure: many were still at their prayers when I had to go.

My friend would not let me go without a glance at the clergy house, lately done up by the great Public School which founded and is responsible for the Mission. I am glad he did, for it revealed something of the secret of that service and its congregation. The five priests live together under rule, and the clean fresh house squared well with the simple living within it. I expect they would disclaim asceticism; but everything seemed to suit the life of men who are always in training for the spiritual race. And what struck me most of all perhaps was the libraries in the brethren's rooms. There was nothing narrow here; on the contrary, the choicest selection of books on History, English Literature, Psychology, not to speak of Theology; and they were obviously books that were cherished to be read, not to be looked at. One could be certain that whatever came from this house would be sincere and sane, marked with the distinction of culture as well as the devotion of faith.

To Devotions so ordered I am not ashamed to confess myself a convert. No development of doctrine beyond the Real Presence of our Lord in the Eucharist is involved; no controversial intention is either expressed or implied. What has happened is that for priests and people alike the Blessed Sacrament is the centre of their devotional and moral life; and they have found in the Holy gifts reserved a source of appeal, a centre of association, an inspiration to prayer which it would seem foolish, if not wrong, to neglect. Fundamentally it is a primitive science—primitive in that strange blending of Word and Sacrament, and of our Lord's presence and self-manifestation through both, which marks the story of the Walk to Emmaus; primitive in its simple devotion to our Lord, like that service of which Pliny writes to Tragan, where the Christians " sang hymns to Christ as God." I could not wonder that, when the boys of the parent Public School have attended the service, they should say to the Vicar: " Sir, why couldn't we have that service in our School Chapel ?"

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique. April, 1926.

The article of outstanding importance in the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* is that by M. Bardy on the career of Asterius the Sophist. The author thinks that Asterius exercised far-reaching influence on the formation and even the very expression of Arian theology, and in proof of this statement he adduces the fact that Marcellus of Ancyra wrote a refutation of the writings of the Sophist. In his *Orationes contra Arianos* and in his *De Synodis* St. Athanasius concerned himself largely with the doctrine taught generally by the Arians of the first generation, and particularly with that advocated by Asterius. The elaborate notes add to the value of this article which deals almost exclusively with the thought of Asterius, not with the thinker of whom, indeed, very little is known. Much of the writing of Asterius is only known through fragments, and M. Bardy recovers these fragments from the works of Athanasius and from those of Marcellus of Ancyra. It is not a very satisfactory method, but it is the method to which the author is reduced by the lack of other evidence. We read with pleasure the acute analysis of the theology of this Sophist. Not many popes of the seventeenth century possess the attractiveness of Innocent XI., for he is the pope who was not afraid to offer prayers in the Vatican for the success of the expedition of William of Orange which landed in Tor Bay. M. Dubruel occupies himself with an account of " Les Congrégations des Affaires de France " during this pontificate, and he brings before our notice much curious information. Gallicanism once more stepped into front rank in French ecclesiastical matters, and M. Dubruel has not a little to say about the extension of the right of " Régale " to all the bishops of France. The law of nature has always maintained a large sphere of influence in France, and it is not, therefore, altogether surprising to see that in the matter of the " Régale " appeal is made to its authority. This is the first instalment of an article that promises to be of importance. M. Tobac contributes notes on the literary unity, the authenticity, and the historicity of the Fourth Gospel. The reviews of books are written with care and with knowledge, and they indicate the true worth of the volume under discussion to the scholar. Nor are the notices of articles in current reviews behind them in value. The specialist, by looking through the contents summarized, can tell if an article is worth looking up, and in this fashion the *Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique* proves of genuine assistance to the serious student.

Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Manchester. January, 1926.

Among many interesting and learned articles in this *Bulletin*, ranging over Dante, Lucretius, and the Koran, perhaps readers of THEOLOGY would best like to hear some results of the researches made by Professor J. N. Farquhar into the historical value of the tradition which makes the Apostle St. Thomas the Evangelist of Northern India.

Professor Farquhar analyzes the apocryphal work known as the *Acts of Judas Thomas*, with the object of discovering whether there are any grains of historical truth hidden among the mass of legendary matter, of which that work chiefly consists. As a result he finds reason to dispute

the theory that the Apostle's work in India is entirely mythical, and that Christianity was not preached in India before the fourth century.

In the first place, the Indian king Gudnaphar, and his brother, Gad, are historical personages. Gudnaphar was the most powerful king of a line of Parthian monarchs who, about 75 B.C., had established themselves in the Panjaub. His reign began in 19 A.D., and he may have continued in power up to 50 or 55 A.D., or even later. His capital, Taxila, was a notable city, "the Oxford of early India." Very shortly after the supposed visit of St. Thomas, this Scytho-Parthian kingdom was entirely overthrown by the Kushans, so completely that the very name and memory of the great dynasty were obliterated. All that we know of it has only recently been discovered by archæological research, and the facts thus brought to light agree strangely with the pertinent parts of the old tradition of the apocryphal "Acts."

These "Acts" were written in Syriac between 180 and 250 A.D., at or near Edessa, as a manual of instruction for visitors to the shrine of St. Thomas in that city whither his remains are said to have been carried by an Edessene merchant. Dr. Farquhar suggests that the compiler of this book had to work upon (*a*) a written document giving an account of St. Thomas' voyage from the Mediterranean to the Panjaub, and (*b*) a tradition about his martyrdom. Whatever does not come from either of these sources is undiluted fiction.

Now the "Acts" relate that St. Thomas went to India as the slave of a merchant named Habban. This, too, may be the name of a real person. Habban may have been a Parthian Jew who had become a Christian—in the Acts of the Apostles the Parthians come first in the list of those who listened to the Apostles' pentecostal sermon (ii. 9). Habban is further described as "a merchant of King Gudnaphar"—that is to say, Commissioner in charge of the King's trade. It was quite usual for Indian kings to trade with the West and to appoint trade agents for that purpose. Habban would thus find himself often obliged to travel between Alexandria and Taxila.

It is also quite possible to connect St. Thomas with Alexandria. His bilingual name, Thomas Didymus, seems to indicate that he was capable of apostolic work, not only in Aramaic, but in Greek as well. If, then, he preached in Alexandria, it is probable that he would meet King Gundaphar's agent who had very likely been a Christian since Pentecost. Perhaps Habban had half-converted some of his fellow-merchants, and Thomas may have finished the work. Yielding to their entreaties, it is not unlikely that he would go back with them when he saw that a door was really opened to the Gospel in the Panjaub. And if he went to Taxila he probably saw the King, as the "Acts" relate.

The story gives us no real information of how the Apostle occupied himself in India, but we can imagine the sort of activities into which he would be drawn in that land of Hindus, Buddhists, and Jains. We hear of a Greek, named Xanthippus, to whom the little Christian community was committed. Habban, as a Parthian Jew, may have had connection with Edessa, and may have induced the Apostle to write to the Church in that place, giving an account of his voyage and reception in India. Such a document would be the genuine literary source of the "Acts." In Dr. Farquhar's opinion the above, among other indications of historical truth, point to a real evangelization of Northern India by the Apostle St. Thomas.

SYNOPTICA

MARK AND Q

One of the possible explanations of likenesses between Mark and Q is that Mark has copied Q.

The purpose of these papers is, in part, to set the Marcan and Q passages side by side, so that readers may judge whether this explanation is satisfactory.

The sayings of Q, for example, are several times found abbreviated in Mark. Are they Mark's abbreviations of Q, or does Mark represent another memory—perhaps St. Peter's memory—of the saying more fully remembered in Q ? Compare two of the passages already printed:

Mark iii. 28. Verily I say unto you, All their sins shall be forgiven unto the sons of men, and their blasphemies wherewith they have blasphemed:

Matt. xii. 32, Luke xii. And everyone who shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him:

Blasphemies of the sons of men, and blasphemy against the Son of man.

It appears that a mistake has found its way here into Q. Its presence in Q is explained by Mark. And Mark, being independent of Q, has escaped the mistake. Again, compare:

Luke xi. 27. And it came to pass, as he said those things, a certain woman out of the multitude lifted up her voice, and said unto him, Blessed is the womb that bare thee, and the breasts which thou didst suck.

28. But he said, Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.

Mark iii. 31. And there come his mother and his brethren; and standing without, they sent unto him, calling him.

32. And a multitude was sitting about him, and they say unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee.

33. And he answereth them, and saith, Who is my mother and my brethren ?

34. And looking round on them which sat round about him, he saith, Behold my mother and my brethren !

35. For whosoever shall do the will of God, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother.

It is difficult to imagine someone who was no more than a copyist who could have made the Mark version out of the Q version. It is simpler to suppose that the same scene, in two independent accounts of it, became Luke xi. 27, 28 and Mark iii. 31-35.

The Marcan and Q versions of this scene have already been printed side by side. And the Mission (and Return) of the disciples (Mark vi. and Matt. x. and Luke x.).

In this is Mark dependent upon Q ?

He adds no detail. He leaves out several. And yet, even here Mark has one advantage over Q.

Q has " no staff," " no shoes." And Q is surely mistaken. Mark has " take nothing save a staff only " and " go shod with sandals." And, surely, Mark is right.

Q's mistake is said to have arisen when the Aramaic was being translated into Greek. Perhaps about 45 A.D. ? The accounts of the Return

have diverged so widely that it will be questioned, no doubt, whether they were ever originated by one episode.

And yet it is suggestive to set them side by side:

Matt. xi. 25. I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou didst hide these things from the wise and understanding, and didst reveal them unto babes:

27. All things are delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.

28. Come unto me, all ye that labour and I will give you rest.

Matt. xiii. 16. Blessed are the eyes which see the things which ye see. . . .

17. For I say unto you, that many prophets and righteous men desired to see the things which ye see, and saw them not.

Mark vi. 30. And the apostles gather themselves together unto Jesus; and they told him all things, whatsoever they had done. . . .

31. Come ye yourselves apart into a desert place and rest awhile. . . .

[And then the multitude running and the boat rowing, and the multitude ready to meet the boat.]

34. And he came forth and saw a great multitude, and he had compassion on them, because they were as "sheep not having a shepherd": and he began to teach them many things.

[And from this pass to a passage which many have argued must once have stood nearer to it, once, than it stands now, Mark ix. 2-13, the Transfiguration.]

Neither of these passages appears to have made any use of the other. And yet, if you will notice the kind of divergence which is found in other "parallel" passages, it seems possible that you will allow that these two accounts go back to one origin.

Notice, for example, the above passage, Luke xi. 27, 28 and Mark iii. 31-35. Q tells of the woman's interruption, Blessed is the womb that bare thee. Mark has simpler words. Hardly more than the people's, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren! And the answer of Jesus, Behold, my mother and my brethren!

In Mark it is His look that is remembered. The story is vivid with the multitude, the mother and brothers, the message passing through the crowd, and that look.

Mark and Q go back to the same scene, but the two memories of it are distinct. They remember it each in his own way.

Remembering this difference of manner, compare these passages of Mark and Q again.

In Mark a multitude on the shore, and Jesus met by them, talking, no doubt, now to the Twelve, and now to the people. It says He said, "Come and rest awhile." It says, He began to teach them many things. It does not say what things. And, in the Transfiguration, plain words: "This is my beloved Son: hear ye Him." But there is the "glistering exceeding white." There is "Elijah with Moses."

And in Q, to correspond, there is the same Revelation of the Son, after the same "Come and rest." You do not know whether it is said to the Twelve or to the people. And there are the "prophets and righteous men" who desired to see.

The suggestion that these passages could converge on one original experience will, no doubt, be thought fantastical by some readers, and I will invite such to pass on and consider another passage of Q, and the corresponding passages of Mark.

But first I must "conjecture" the Q passage.

In any reconstruction of Q, attention will be drawn to four passages: Matt. xvii. 20; xviii. 7; xviii. 12, 13; xviii. 15, 21, 22. In Luke, xvii. 6; xvii. 1; xv. 4-7; xvii. 3.

They are obviously an original group of passages, in Q. Their juxtaposition obviously goes back to Q, and yet, as they stand, I can see no obvious reason for their being grouped together.

It is only when they are read side by side with the corresponding passages of Mark that their grouping together is explained.

The quarrels, for example, of grown-up men and the reverence due to little children are distinct subjects. But they are not kept distinct here, or in Mark. And Mark explains why, for, as Mark shows, both these early traditions go back to one scene—a scene in which Jesus was speaking to angry grown-up men, and speaking to them with a little child in His arms.

I am trying to draw up, side by side, a Mark story of which the thread runs on in order of time, and the Q parallel passages.

I left Mark at vi. And took him up again at ix. The interval is one of the passages of Mark where the arrangement appears most to have been dictated by other considerations than the desire to tell a plain straightforward story in order of time. I will take from Mark ix., x., xi. the passages in which the straightforward thread of the story can most clearly be traced. And, out of Q, I will gather together such passages as our Marcan story suggests belonged to this part of the Gospel.

But in order to reconstruct Q, starting from those passages, Luke xvii. 6; xvii. 1; xv. 4-7; xvii. 3, it will be necessary to take great liberties with the order in which Q passages are now found in Luke.

I propose to restore to this group Luke xxii. 30; vii. 29, 30; x. 25; xi. 37-52; xii. 34, 35.

Those who hold that the καθεξῆς of Luke i. 3 belongs to our present edition of the Gospel will be unwilling, no doubt, to grant this permission. Yet they must be asked again, until they grant it.

For, I suggest, it is in Luke's manner to remove Luke xxii. 30 to the Last Supper. The words "eat and drink at my table" are enough to account for his doing that. And Luke vii. 29 is given by Matthew in another and likelier connection in Matt. xxi. 32.

And Luke x. 25-27 is, quite clearly, out of its original place to serve, in Luke's manner, as a kind of text to the Parable of the Good Samaritan.

And Luke xi. 37-52 has actually split in two a Q saying, Luke xi. 33 and xii. 2, of which the two pieces can be seen in one at Mark iv. 21, 22.

And Matthew bears witness that Luke xii. 34, 35 belonged, in Q, to Luke xi. 37-52.

Now, if Mark's arrangement of his story is, in some cases, due not to the time-order but to purposes of instruction, and if Matthew follows Mark's order, and if Luke has made very free with the order of Q, we are left without any very clear or certain guidance.

And yet it need not be impossible to arrive at a probable order, following Mark where Mark will guide us, and supposing, for an experiment, that Q's order was more like the original Mark order than is commonly supposed.

Mark ix. 30. And they went forth from thence, and passed through Galilee; and he would not that any man should know it.

31. For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered up into the hands of men, and they shall kill him. . . .

Luke xii. 49. I came to cast fire upon the earth; and what will I, if it is already kindled?

50. But I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished!

The Quarrel of the Disciples and the Lesson of the Little Child.

33. And they came to Capernaum: and when he was in the house he asked them, What were ye reasoning in the way ?

34. But they held their peace: for they had disputed one with another in the way who was the greatest.

35. And he sat down, and called the twelve; [and he saith unto them, If any man would be first, he shall be last of all, and minister of all].

36. And he took a little child, and set him in the midst of them: and taking him in his arms, he said unto them,

37. Whosoever shall receive one of such little children in my name, receiveth me: and whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me.

41. And whosoever shall give [to one of these little ones] a cup of water to drink, Verily I say unto you, he shall in no wise lose his reward.

42. And whosoever shall cause one of these little ones . . . to stumble, it were better for him if a great millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were cast into the sea.

Matt. x. 42. And whosoever shall give to drink unto me of these little ones a cup of cold water only. . . .

Luke xvii. 1. Woe unto the world because of occasions of stumbling ! for it must needs be that occasions come; but woe to that man through whom the occasion cometh !

2. It were better for him if a millstone were hanged about his neck, and he were thrown into the sea, rather than that he should cause one of these little ones to stumble.

Mark x. 13. And they brought unto him little children that he should touch them: and his disciples rebuked them.

14. But when Jesus saw it he was moved with indignation, and said unto them, Suffer the little children to come unto me; forbid them not: for of such is the kingdom of God.

15. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdom of God as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein.

16. And he took them in his arms, and blessed them, laying his hands upon them.

Matt. xviii. 10. See that ye despise not one of those little ones; for I say unto you that in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.

12. How think ye ? if any man have a hundred sheep, and one of them be gone astray, doth he not leave the ninety and nine, and go unto the mountains, and seek that which goeth astray ?

13. And if so be that he find it, verily I say unto you, he rejoiceth over it more than over the ninety and nine which have not gone astray.

14. Even so it is not the will of your Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish.

[? Incident of the rich man's failure to follow Jesus, and Peter's saying,]

28. Lo, we have left all, and have followed thee.

29. Jesus said, Verily, I say unto you, There is no man that hath left house, or

Luke xii. 28., Matt. xix. 28 [but ye are they] which have followed me . . . [when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory] ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

brethren, or sisters, or mother, or father, or children, or lands, for my sake,

30. But he shall receive a hundredfold now in this time, houses, and brethren, and sisters, and mothers and children and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to come eternal life.

[Dr. Bacon has pointed out the added force of Mark x. 14, 28, if they follow, without interruption, on ix. 30, 33. The children are brought to say "Goodbye," as their fathers set out on that fateful journey. The disciples' minds full of the coming kingdom, and they are told "of such is the kingdom." And x. 29, Peter is thinking of the home so lately left behind.]

32. And they were in the way going up to Jerusalem; and Jesus was going before them: and they were [He was] amazed; and they that followed were afraid. . . .

35. And there came near unto him James and John . . . Master, we would that thou shouldst do for us whatsoever we shall ask. . . .

37. And they said unto him, Grant unto us that we may sit, one on thy right hand, and one on thy left hand in thy glory.

38. But Jesus said unto them, Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup that I drink? or to be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?

41. And when the ten heard it they began to be moved with indignation concerning James and John:

Matt. xix. 28. . . . sit upon twelve thrones. . . .

[Luke xii. 50. I have a baptism to be baptized with.]

Matt. xviii. 21. How oft shall my brother sin against me, and I forgive him? Until seven times?

22. Jesus saith unto him, I say not unto thee, Until seven times; but, Until seventy times seven.

Luke xxii. 24. And there arose a contention among them, which of them is accounted to be greatest.

25. And he said unto them, The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over them; and they that have authority over them are called Benefactors.

26. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greater among you let him become as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.

27. For whether is greater, he that sitteth at meat, or he that serveth? is not he that sitteth at meat? but I am in the midst of you as he that serveth.

42. And Jesus called them to him, and saith unto them, Ye know that they which are accounted to rule over the Gentiles, lord it over them; and their great ones exercise authority over them.

43. But it is not so among you: but whosoever would become great among you, shall be your minister:

44. And whosoever would be first among you, shall be servant of all.

45. For verily the Son of man came not to be ministered unto but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

Mark xi. 23. Have faith in God. Verily I say unto you, whosoever shall say unto this mountain, Be thou taken up and cast into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall believe that what he saith cometh to pass; he shall have it.

Luke xvii. 5. And the apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith.

6. And the Lord said, If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye would say unto this sycamore tree, Be thou rooted up, and be thou planted in the sea; and it would have obeyed you.

7. But who is there of you, having a servant ploughing or keeping sheep, that will say unto him, when he is come in from the field, Come straightway and sit down to meat. . . .

Mark's version " of the mountain " seems to belong, where Mark has placed it, to the Mount of Olives overlooking the Dead Sea. We are, if so, in the story of the Last Week.

Final Warnings to the Jews.

Mark xi. 27. . . . " by what authority ?"

29. And Jesus said unto them, I will ask you one question, and answer me, and I will tell you by what authority I do these things.

30. The baptism of John, was it from heaven or from men ? answer me.

31, 32, 33.

Matt. xxi. 28. A man had two sons; and he came to the first, and said, Son go work to-day in my vineyard. . . .

31. Whether of the twain did the will of his father ? They say, The first. Jesus saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you [Luke vii. 29, 30].

32. For John came unto you in the way of righteousness, and ye believed him not: but the publicans and the harlots believed him: and ye when ye saw it did not even repent yourselves afterward, that ye might believe him.

Luke xii. 54. When ye see a cloud rising in the west. . . . 55. a south wind blowing . . . 58. As thou art going with thine adversary . . . agree with him . . . 59. Thou shalt by no means come out thence, till thou have paid the last farthing.

Luke xiii. 1. The Galilæans . . . 4. The tower of Siloam . . . 5. Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish.

Mark xi. 12-17, 20-21. The figtree.

Mark xii. 1. And he began to speak unto them in parables. A man "planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a pit for the winepress, and built a tower," and let it out to husbandmen, and went into another country.

9. What therefore will the lord of the vineyard do ? he will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others.

10. Have ye not read even this scripture: "The stone which the builders rejected, the same was made the head of the corner:

11. This was from the Lord, and it is marvellous in our eyes " [Ps. cxviii. 22].

6. A certain man had a figtree planted in his vineyard; and he came seeking fruit thereon, and found none.

7. And he saith unto the vinedresser, Behold, these three years I come seeking fruit on this figtree, and find none: cut it down. . . .

9. And if it bear fruit thenceforth, *well ;* but if not, thou shalt cut it down.

The Scribe's Question.

Mark xii. 28. And one of the scribes . . . asked him, What commandment is the greatest of all ?

29. Jesus answered, The first is, Hear O Israel; the Lord our God, the Lord is one:

30. And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength.

Luke x. 25. And behold a certain lawyer stood up and tempted him, saying, Master, what shall I do to inherit eternal life ?

26. And he said unto him, What is written in the law ? how readest thou ?

27. And he answering said, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy strength, and with all thy mind; (Deut.

31. The second is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these.

32. And the scribe said unto him, Of a truth, Master, thou hast well said. . . .

34. And . . . Jesus . . . said, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God.

vi. 4, 5) and thy neighbour as thyself (Lev. xix. 18).

28. And he said unto him, Thou hast answered right: this do, and thou shalt live (Lev. xviii. 5).

Denunciation of the Pharisees.

Mark xii. 38. And in his teaching he said, Beware of the scribes, which desire to walk in long robes, and to have salutations in the market-places,

39. And chief seats in the synagogues, and chief places at feasts:

40. they which devour widows' houses and for a pretence make long prayers; these shall receive greater condemnation.

Matt. xxiii. 13. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees hypocrites! because ye shut the kingdom of heaven against men: for ye enter not in yourselves, neither suffer ye them that are entering in to enter (Luke xi. 52).

6. Woe . . . for ye love the chief seats in the synagogues and the salutations in the market-places (Luke xi. 43).

23. Woe unto you . . . for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin . . . (Luke xi. 42).

27. Woe . . . for ye are like unto whited sepulchres (Luke xi. 44).

29. . . . ye build the sepulchres of the prophets (Luke xi. 47).

34. Therefore [said the wisdom of God] I will send unto them prophets, and wise men, and scribes; and some of them they shall kill and persecute;

[Mark xii. 2. He sent to the husbandmen a servant . . . and they took him and beat him . . . 4. And again . . . another; . . . and him they wounded . . . 5. And another; and him they killed: and many others; beating some and killing some.]

35. That the blood of all the prophets . . . may come upon this generation; from the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zachariah who perished between the altar and the sanctuary: yea, I say, all these things shall come upon this generation.

37. O Jerusalem, Jerusalem. . . .

38. Behold your house is left unto you desolate.

39. For I say unto you, Ye shall not see me till ye shall say, Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord [Ps. cxviii. 26].

Mark xiii. 1. And as he went forth out of the temple, one of his disciples saith unto him, Master behold, what manner of stones, and what manner of buildings!

2. And Jesus said unto him, Seest thou these great buildings? There shall not be left one stone upon another, which shall not be thrown down.

The reader will judge whether, in these passages, Mark and Q appear to be two independent and trustworthy witnesses, who illustrate and corroborate one another; differing because they are independent, and agreeing because they are trustworthy.

J. M. C. Crum.

REVIEW

FAITH AND TRUTH. By F. H. Brabant and P. Hartill. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This is a little book of great value. Its aim is to show that the "Catholic way of thinking about God and about man can take in, now as in the past, all new knowledge without bursting under the strain." It is by no means easy to determine the relation between sound philosophy and Catholic Christianity. But it is a task which no thoughtful Christian can rightly avoid, for as this book forcibly brings home to us, it is intolerable that we should separate our thinking from our acting and praying. Even simple folk, who are "no scholars," must have some kind of philosophy. This book, difficult as they may find some of its chapters, will help them to get a philosophy which is sound. Among more learned readers there may possibly be some who think that there is a conflict between science and religion, simply because they have tried to combine excellent up-to-date science with a philosophy which is obsolete: if they will study this book with an open mind it may help them to get a truer philosophy and to see the essential reasonableness of the Christian Faith. We want both philosophy and spiritual experience. "Let us keep our faith rich with both contributions, and not make religion a mere practical dodge for living well, nor philosophy the cold douche of a disillusioning reality." The authors have achieved their aim and done a useful piece of work in enabling Christian people to think more clearly and therefore to pray better and to give a more effective service.

The book needs a long review to do it justice. It is full of good things. One would like to quote at length what it has to say on such subjects as "the supernatural," the problem of evil, the meaning of the "personality" of God, the reason why we need "dogma" about Our Lord's Person, the true character of "freedom," the significance of the Atonement, the nature of the Presence of Our Lord in the Eucharist, the meaning of "Eternal Life." The exposition of these difficult themes could hardly be bettered. On one subject only—the rationale of punishment—the present reviewer is unable to follow the authors. "We have already . . . given reasons for accepting the Retributive view, *i.e.*, that the justification of punishment is to be found in past sin, *not* in future amendment, although amendment *may follow* when the sinner accepts the retribution as just" (the italics are mine). It is perfectly true that the "retributive" view, rightly understood, must be retained: but

why the " not " ? Why separate retribution from reformation ? Logically they are separable: in actual experience they cannot be divided.

The book is written from a Catholic standpoint, and the writers are careful to keep in view the Catholics of the East, as well as those of the Roman obedience—not forgetting that our part of Western Catholicism has its contribution to make. But " Catholic " as the authors rightly claim to be, there is hardly any part of their argument which would be unacceptable to any well-read " evangelical " or " liberal." Doubtless the extreme modernist would dissent from their insistence on the fixed element in the Christian Faith. But most of us would agree that " in Catholicism alone we are saved from the tyranny of a *mere* traditionalism which would render human thought worthless, and from the uncertainty of a *mere* ' modernism ' which would offer a perpetual flux of changing doctrines to those who would rest in God's eternal changelessness."

This volume should be widely read and carefully pondered. It is to be hoped that its authors may have further contributions to make to the development of a sound Christian philosophy, and to a clearer understanding of the Christian Faith.

J. A. LICHFIELD.

INDEX OF VOLUME XII

JANUARY—JUNE, 1926

PAGE

Baron von Hügel 316

Books Reviewed:

According to St. John. By Lord Charnwood 181

Acts of the Apostles. By L. E. Browne 180

Ante-Nicene Exegesis of Gospels. By H. Smith, D.D.—

Vol. I. 116

Vol. II. 292

Applied Religion. By Bishop Maud 296

Arnold Thomas of Bristol. By N. Micklem 118

Ascent of Man, The. By Arthur Machin 59

Bar-Hebræus. By W. E. W. Carr 292

Cambridge Ancient History, The. Vol. III. 229

Cathedral Churches of England. By A. Hamilton Thompson 178

Christ in His Church. By Bishop Temple 60

Church of the Spirit, The. By F. G. Peabody 234

Churchman's Popular Library, The 237

Conway Morgan. By C. Linda Morgan 290

Deutero-Isaiah. By Reuben Levy 295

Divine Society, The. By W. G. Peck 236

Early Church and the World, The. By C. J. Cadoux 117

English Church and the Reformation, The. By C. S. Carter 233

Essays and Letters on Orders and Jurisdiction. By F. W. Puller . . . 231

Ethics of the Gospel, The. By F. A. M. Spencer 236

Faith and Truth. By Brabant and Hartill 556

Fourth Evangelist, The. By C. F. Nolloth 173

Israel and Babylon. By W. Lansdell Wardle 175

Jeremy Taylor. By W. J. Brown 235

Jesus Among the Children. By C. S. Woodward 177

Jesus, Life of. By Georges Berguer 291

Jesus of Nazareth. By J. Klausner 238

Johannes Scotus Erigena. By Henry Bett 239

John Henry Newman. By Newport White, D.D. 235

Landmarks in Struggle between Science and Religion. By J. G. Simpson . 179

Lives of the Saints. By Alban Butler 294

Love and the Messianic Age. By Paul Levertoff 114

Luther and the Reformation. Vol. I. By James Mackinnon, D.D. . . . 118

Nestorius, The Bazaar of Heracleides 293

Non-Rational Character of Faith, The. By E. E. Thomas 59

One Body and the One Spirit, The. By T. A. Lacey 115

Origin of Islam. By Richard Bell 295

Philosophy and the Christian Experience. By W. Richmond 115

Practical Faith, A. By Harold Anson 234

Punishment, Human and Divine. By W. C. de Pauley 180

Quest for God in China, The. By F. W. S. O'Neill 237

Sacramentary, The. By Ildefonso Schuster 232

St. Augustine's City of God. By J. E. C. Welldon, D.D. 42

St. Augustine's City of God. By Joseph Rickaby, D.D. 42

St. Augustine on the Spirit and the Letter. By W. J. Sparrow-Simpson, D.D. . 113

St. Mark. By A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D. 225

Science, Religion, and Reality. Ed. by Joseph Needham 49

Short Notices 297, 240, 119

Songs of Praise 170

Sukkah, Mishna, and Tosefta. By A. W. Greenup 293

Through Human Eyes. By F. C. Williams 177

Triumphant Goodness. By J. S. Hastie 177

William Robertson Nicoll. By T. H. Darlow 110

BRABANT, F. H. 289

BROWNING, B. A. 140

Canterbury and York Society 108

Christ in Us 185

CLARKE, W. K. L. 104, 163, 217, 282

COCK, A. A. 316

COOPER, C. 148

PAGE

Correspondence 31, 287
Crum, J. M. C. 275, 350
de Pauley, W. C. 331
Divine "Must," The 140
Dr. Johnson's Religion 207
Editorial 1, 61, 181, 241, 301
Eisler on the Last Supper 104
Fletcher, J. S. 110
Foakes Jackson, F. J. 72
Francis Bacon 302
Graham, E. 225
Guillaume, A. 2, 63
Henry Montague Butler 83
Hutton, W. H. 72, 302
Idea of Man in Athanasius 331
James, E. O. 21
Judd, A. F. 11
Knox, W. L. 197
Lacey, T. A. 169
Levertoff, P. P. 339
Lichfield, Bishop of 357
Lyttelton, E. 134
Magic and Religion 21
Mark and "Q" 275
Mark, Lost Ending of 218
Miracles, Belief in 266
Miracles and Comparative Religion 252
Miracles and Sacraments 258
Miraculous and Supernatural 245
Miscellanea 30, 101, 163, 217, 275, 346
Montizambert, E. 185
Mozley, J. K. 252
Mysticism of St. Augustine, The 11
New Liddell and Scott, The 284
Non-Juror's Latin Poems 285
Odes of Solomon 38
Old Catholic Congress, The Tenth 72
Opening of Second Gospel, The 283
Our Lord's Ascension 241
Pastoral Visiting To-day 148
Periodicals 101, 106, 221, 288, 348
Prideaux, S. P. T. 38
Primrose, C. L. 207
Psychology and Aspects of Catholicism 122
Questions on the Eucharist 197
Russian Philosopher on Judaism and Christianity 339
Scott-Moncrieff, C. E. 218
Selwyn, E. G. 32, 88, 181, 241, 266
Servant Poems in Deutero-Isaiah 2, 63, 155
Service of Devotion, A 346
Sir Edwyn Hoskyns 88, 155
Stoic Elements in New Testament 169
Studies in Texts 103, 163
Style of Our Lord's Discourses 282
Synoptica 350
Taylor, A. E. 54, 245
Thouless, R. H. 122
Verses 220
Watkin Williams 42
Webb, C. C. J. 258
What we Believe about God 134

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER